

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3462. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 3463. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3464. A bill to provide for the mobilization of the scientific resources and knowledge of the United States for the purpose of seeking the causes and cure of cancer, heart disease, infantile paralysis, and other diseases of mankind; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 3465. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 3466. A bill to clarify and amend section 2 of the act of Congress of February 11, 1929, with respect to the granting of relief by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in cases in which certain special assessments have been paid and later held to be void or erroneous; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3467. A bill for the relief of the city of Needles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 3468. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to grant certain personnel equitable treatment in the matter of leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3469. A bill to promote the national security by providing for the coordination of all elements of national security, and for the reorganization of the military structure of the Nation to conform to the requirements of modern warfare; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 3470. A bill to provide for pilgrimages of gold-star mothers, sisters, and wives to the graves of their sons, brothers, and husbands who died in the service of the armed forces of the United States during World War II and who are buried in foreign lands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 3471. A bill to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3472. A bill to provide disability benefits for persons who performed uncompensated services in the administration of the Selective Training and Service System and the emergency price control and rationing program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3473. A bill to provide for nonrecognition of gain or loss in the case of anticipatory replacement of property condemned for public use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 3474. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act to permit compensation or reimbursement in certain cases to persons acting in a representative or fiduciary capacity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 211. A resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Public Works to conduct surveys of certain works of improvement; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3475. A bill for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN of New York:

H. R. 3476. A bill for the relief of James J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 3477. A bill for the relief of Mattia Racine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 3478. A bill for the relief of the California-Pacific Utilities Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

511. By Mr. KING: Petition signed by 64 residents of Inglewood, Calif., urging the passage of S. 265, which would prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

512. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition relative to the Capper bill, S. 265, which penalizes interstate transmission, by mail or otherwise, of newspapers, periodicals, news reels, photographic films, or records advertising alcoholic beverages or soliciting orders therefor, advertising by radio being also prohibited, as well as the sending of circulars, letters, and so forth, into States which bar liquor advertisements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

513. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. Daisy McConnell and other members of the Methodist Church of Chariton, Iowa, in the interest of S. 265, S. 623, H. R. 142, and H. R. 2408; to the Committee on Armed Services.

514. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition forwarded by Mrs. A. J. Abing, route 3, Blissfield, Mich., and signed by 14 other residents of the community, urging favorable action on the Capper bill, S. 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

515. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of residents of Snow Hill, Md., urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising and broadcasting alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

516. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Lt. Robert P. Grover Post, No. 377, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, Jersey City, N. J., opposing the enactment of H. R. 318, a bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., Chaplain of the House of Representatives, offered the following prayer:

Thou who art our merciful Heavenly Father upon earth, hear us as we tarry at the altar of prayer. We art Thine,

and Thou wilt surely hear us when we call and answer us when we pray.

"Made in His image" is the blessed word in the front door of the immortal Book. O direct us that we may never violate our sacred inheritance. Give us to understand that rich character is the offspring of unbiased meditation inspired by honest purpose. Grant that all decisions of this august body may be couched in wisdom; O keep us this day without sin and abide with all in the measure of a great peace.

In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 14, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, May 15, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

S. 874. An act to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as Alternate Representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, Deputy Representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations, to be reappointed to the Foreign Service.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA (H. DOC. NO. 254)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 5394.)

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CONVENTIONS ON PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations which was approved by the General Assembly by a resolution adopted February 13, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION OF WOMEN

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for participation by the United States in the Inter-American Commission of Women, and authorizing an appropriation therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON REMODELING OF SENATE AND HOUSE CAUCUS ROOMS AND RESTAURANTS

A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report with regard to the remodeling of the Senate and House caucus rooms and restaurants (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

AUDIT REPORT OF WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

A copy of a letter dated May 13, 1947, from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, addressed to the Comptroller General of the United States, relating to the report on the audit of the War Shipping Administration by the Comptroller General for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

I AM AN AMERICAN DAY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate an invitation to the Senate from the chairman of the District of Columbia I Am An American Day Committee inviting Senators to participate in the program. Without objection, the invitation will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the invitation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I AM AN AMERICAN DAY COMMITTEE
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1947.
Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: On behalf of the committee for the observance of I Am An American Day for the District of Columbia, I desire to extend to you and all other Members of the Senate a most cordial invitation to attend the ceremonies in connection with this observance, to be held at the Sylvan Theater, Monument Grounds, Sunday, May 18, at 3 p. m.

The Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, will be the principal speaker, and our program includes the Army Band; Edward J. Arnold, motion-picture star and originator of I Am An American Day; Hildegard; Arnold Eidus, the young violin genius; the Howard University choir of 40 voices; and others.

If it is possible to have some announcement made in the Senate Chamber or otherwise concerning this ceremony, it would be

greatly appreciated, as we should like to have many of the Members present to enjoy the exercises.

Thanking you in advance for your courtesy and cooperation in the matter, and trusting we may have the pleasure of your appearance on Sunday, I remain,

Respectfully,

HERRERT J. JACOBI,
Chairman.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relating to the rate of interest on land sales, and requesting the Congress of the United States to approve amendments herein set forth of chapter 78 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. Effective upon approval by the Congress of the United States, chapter 78 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, is amended in the following respects:

"(a) By amending section 4565 thereof by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"The rate of interest charged upon any sale of public lands for homestead, residence, or other purposes shall not exceed 4 percent per annum."

"(b) By amending section 4601 thereof by deleting from paragraph numbered '1' thereof the words 'six percent' and inserting in lieu thereof 'four percent.'

"SEC. 2. Effective upon approval by the Congress of the United States, the rate of interest on all special sale agreements and special homestead agreements theretofore made is reduced to 4 percent per annum as to interest thereafter accruing.

"SEC. 3. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to ratify and approve sections 1 and 2 of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 4. The commissioner of public lands is hereby requested and, insofar as lies within the power of the legislature, directed to fix the rate of interest charged upon any sale of public lands hereafter made for homestead, residence, or other purposes at not more than 4 percent per annum.

"Approved this 8th day of May A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to increase the compensation of certain public officers in the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas in 1945 the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii did adopt Joint Resolution No. 10 requesting the Congress of the United States of America to increase the compensation of certain Territorial and Federal officers; and

"Whereas the compensation now paid to certain Territorial and Federal officers in the Territory of Hawaii is utterly inadequate to compensate them in view of their duties and responsibilities or to enable them to meet the heavy expenses involved in the proper performance of their respective duties and the maintenance of the services required of them by law or demanded of them by the communities which they represent; and

"Whereas such condition has resulted and will continue to result in deterring able citizens in moderate financial circumstances from seeking public offices; and

"Whereas in 1946 by enacting Public Law 601, the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, increased the compensation of the Members of the Congress including that of the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii; and

"Whereas the twenty-third session of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii enacted Act 261 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1945, providing for the payment by the Territory of Hawaii of additional compensation to certain public officers so as to augment the compensation fixed by Federal law until such time as Federal increases are granted: Now therefore

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested and urged to amend section 92 of the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for an increase in the compensation of the following officers: Governor of the Territory of Hawaii, chief justice and associate justices of the supreme court of the Territory of Hawaii, judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, secretary of the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. For the reason that the compensation of the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii is fixed by the Congress of the United States in conformity with the compensation paid to other members of the Congress, no request is hereby made as to an increase in his compensation, but the same is left to the sound discretion of the Congress.

"SEC. 3. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall forthwith be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States, and the Judiciary Committees thereof, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Attorney General of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 8th day of May A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,
Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 45

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to maintain constant water levels in the Mississippi River

"Whereas a constant and stable water level in the upper Mississippi River is highly desirable and of vital importance in the interest of agriculture, forestation, wildlife, recreation and sanitation in Wisconsin; and

"Whereas the United States War Department is by Federal law restricted to operation and administration of the nine-foot channel dam pools in said river solely in the interest of navigation and flood control with resultant winter and other periodic drawdowns; and

"Whereas such drawdowns have caused lowering of lakes and marshland and taxed the subsurface moisture of the State, causing undue damage to agriculture, forestation, wildlife, and recreation values, and further, causing extreme aggravation to many communities in their efforts to maintain necessary sanitation standards; and

"Whereas these periodic drawdowns are very detrimental to the fish and wildlife resources and recreational values, which the Federal Government has recognized and sought to perpetuate by creating and maintaining the upper Mississippi River Fish and Wildlife Refuge: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to give proper and due recognition

to these valuable assets by enacting legislation amending the present act governing operation of said dam pools in such manner as will give the same position to agriculture, forestation, wildlife, recreation, and sanitation as is now given by law to navigation and flood control; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each Wisconsin Member of Congress."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 240 citizens of Washington, D. C., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3245. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 175).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1289. A bill to exclude certain lands from becoming a part of the Colville Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. LODGE, Mr. BALDWIN, and Mr. IVES) introduced Senate bill 1290, to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1291. A bill for the relief of Manuel DeSousa Grade; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 1292. A bill for the relief of Ramon Formoso Lago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming) introduced Senate bill 1293, to enable the Veterans' Administration to provide housing units for certain disabled veterans of World War II, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1294. A bill to permit grants for old-age assistance in the case of individuals who are inmates of public institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Claire M. Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1296. A bill for the relief of James A. Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1297. A bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1298. A bill to validate payments heretofore made by disbursing officers of the United States Government covering cost of shipment of household effects of civilian employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jer-

sey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill providing for national school health services.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1290) to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. SMITH, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. LODGE, Mr. BALDWIN, and Mr. IVES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is a suggested Federal grant-in-aid program to the 48 States and Territories. It aims to improve and extend health facilities for American school children. This legislation does not seek to be all-inclusive or pretend to be the only answer to the fundamental and long-neglected problem of improving the health of our young people. However, it will make a modest start toward establishing a national policy whereby our American children will not be permitted to reach maturity with physical or mental defects which can be diagnosed or corrected in the early stages. Such a policy designed to meet this undisputed health problem may be considered one of the soundest investments we can now make in our Nation's future.

Briefly, the national school health services bill will assist States to:

First. Provide and maintain school health services for the prevention and diagnosis of physical and mental defects and conditions. This would mean, for example, more thorough examinations to determine whether the child is gaining weight and would detect faulty teeth, eyes, heart, and so forth.

Second. Provide for follow-up treatment of such defects and conditions especially in rural areas and areas of severe economic distress where the need obviously is most pressing.

Third. Provide for demonstrations and training of personnel for State and local school-health services.

Fourth. Integrate new services, made possible by funds under this bill, with the health activities and facilities presently provided by the communities.

Fifth. Establish a School Health Services Board comprised of the Chief of the Children's Bureau as chairman, the United States Commissioner of Education, and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, to work with the Children's Bureau in considering and approving State plans.

Sixth. Establish a National Advisory Committee on School Health Services of 12 members appointed by the President. The members would include representatives of health, education, and child welfare.

The initial appropriation for this child-health program would be \$10,000,000.

Ten percent of this sum would be earmarked for training personnel, for demonstrations, and for Federal administrative purposes. One-half of the remainder would be matched dollar for dollar by the States. The other half would be allocated on an unmatched basis to the States according to a definite formula, using per capita Federal income-tax payments and the number of children between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive, in each State as factors. After the first year the Federal appropriations would be raised to fifteen millions.

In offering this bill on behalf of my colleagues and myself, may I stress the following points:

First. State planning for the proposed school-health services and the actual administration of the program would be left entirely to the discretion of State agencies. Federal standards would be set up but there would be no Washington interference and dictation. As there might be jurisdictional overlapping between State health and education agencies in carrying out the program, this bill would leave this administrative question in the hands of State officials. With the advice of the School Health Services Board and the National Advisory Committee, the Federal Security Administrator would handle the program on the Federal level through the Children's Bureau, and in matters involving State education agencies would utilize the services of the Office of Education.

Second. Our bill aims directly at the heart of this problem through the existing administrative set-ups in the State and National government.

Third. States would offer all school-health services—examinations, preventive, and corrective work—under this bill with complete disregard for race, color, or creed.

The wealth of experience and study which documents the present unsatisfactory state of our youth's health is unlimited. Selective Service records from September 1942 through June 1943 reveal, for example, that 28 percent of our young men 18 years old were rejected because of physical or mental handicaps—about the same rate of rejection as was experienced during the First World War. George J. Hecht, published of Parents' Magazine, recently stated that one child in every 20 born each year will spend some time in a mental hospital—yet there are 25 States without a single child guidance clinic and thousands of communities have no program for early detection and treatment of mental disorders. The United States Children's Bureau recently reported that three-fourths of the Nation's 30,000,000 children need dental care. We all know of many such instances in our own communities that distress us and impel us to try to improve the health of our young people.

I trust that this bill may act as a foundation on which to build a sound and practical answer to this great problem. An almost identical bill was introduced in the House by Representative HOWELL, of Illinois, on February 17 and is now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Other general health measures have been filed

during this session, but I believe no legislation has been introduced in the Senate which addresses itself solely to the specific health problem of our school children. I hope it may receive an early hearing and get the benefit of further suggestions that will be helpful.

I have had prepared a table which gives a rough estimate of how the unmatched Federal funds would be allotted to the several States under the formula I have proposed. I wish to emphasize that these percentages are necessarily only estimates at best because they are based on 1943 figures. This certainly was not a normal year as regards population and income, but they were the most recent figures I was able to obtain. I respectfully ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State percentage of unmatched funds under proposed national child-health services bill, based on 1943 Census Bureau and Treasury figures

State	Population 5 to 17 years, inclusive	Per capita Federal income tax payments	Percent of total fund under bill
1. Alabama.....	790,000	\$18.71	5.04
2. Arizona.....	148,000	28.44	.62
3. Arkansas.....	488,000	16.11	3.61
4. California.....	1,452,000	63.62	2.72
5. Colorado.....	245,000	38.99	.75
6. Connecticut.....	341,000	85.51	.48
7. Delaware.....	57,000	161.74	.04
8. District of Columbia.....	144,000	106.37	.16
9. Florida.....	452,000	32.90	1.64
10. Georgia.....	825,000	24.06	4.09
11. Idaho.....	120,000	31.04	.46
12. Illinois.....	1,504,000	71.33	2.52
13. Indiana.....	729,000	45.15	1.93
14. Iowa.....	501,000	30.29	1.97
15. Kansas.....	372,000	32.41	1.97
16. Kentucky.....	704,000	17.03	4.33
17. Louisiana.....	611,000	25.52	2.86
18. Maine.....	188,000	34.45	.65
19. Maryland.....	427,000	68.78	.74
20. Massachusetts.....	832,000	57.12	1.74
21. Michigan.....	1,196,000	68.38	2.09
22. Minnesota.....	555,000	40.38	1.64
23. Mississippi.....	594,000	11.75	6.03
24. Missouri.....	751,000	40.69	2.20
25. Montana.....	109,000	40.33	.32
26. Nebraska.....	270,000	36.88	.87
27. Nevada.....	27,000	91.77	.04
28. New Hampshire.....	98,000	40.63	.29
29. New Jersey.....	805,000	62.44	1.54
30. New Mexico.....	152,000	23.96	.76
31. New York.....	2,403,000	83.09	3.45
32. North Carolina.....	977,000	18.53	6.29
33. North Dakota.....	145,000	19.88	.87
34. Ohio.....	1,418,000	56.28	3.01
35. Oklahoma.....	535,000	21.62	2.95
36. Oregon.....	225,000	51.65	.52
37. Pennsylvania.....	2,083,000	66.98	3.71
38. Rhode Island.....	144,000	57.74	.30
39. South Carolina.....	542,000	14.48	4.47
40. South Dakota.....	137,000	16.59	.99
41. Tennessee.....	739,000	22.27	3.96
42. Texas.....	1,575,000	34.90	5.39
43. Utah.....	157,000	28.62	.65
44. Vermont.....	75,000	28.90	.31
45. Virginia.....	708,000	26.69	3.16
46. Washington.....	364,000	56.57	.77
47. West Virginia.....	499,000	20.81	2.86
48. Wisconsin.....	659,000	37.84	2.08
49. Wyoming.....	56,000	41.32	.16
Total.....	28,928,000	49.21	100.00

¹ Average.

HOUSING FOR PARAPLEGICS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] and myself, I ask

unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide housing for persons who are commonly known as paraplegics. They are veterans of World War I and World War II who sustained spine injuries of such severity that they will be doomed to wheel chairs the remainder of their lives. A considerable number of such veterans are married. The majority of them, of course, entered the service without any considerable amount of funds, and, therefore, they presently have no money with which to build homes.

The cost of the particular type of home needed by a paraplegic is considerably higher than that of the average home. The New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, working with the Red Cross, has been doing excellent work in the preparation of plans and blueprints of suitable homes for paraplegics. However, notwithstanding the excellent work that is being done, the veteran is still left without money and without other means of building a home.

The bill provides that the Veterans' Administration may secure the land, build a home, and turn the deed over to the disabled veteran.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I am very sympathetic with the purpose of the bill. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin how many veterans would be covered by the proposed legislation.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not have the exact number of paraplegics. The number is roughly 2,300. The entire 2,300 may not desire homes. Some of them may continue residing in hospitals. Nor do I have the number of paraplegics who are married. I know that a sizable number of those young men were married before they entered the service and have families. They, I am sure, will take advantage of the provisions of the bill and request that homes be built for them.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1293) to enable the Veterans' Administration to provide housing units for certain disabled veterans of World War II, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING FOR VETERANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2181) relating to institutional on-farm training for veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead

of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 190. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

FORMATION OF A UNITED EUROPE—ADDRESS BY WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday Mr. Winston Churchill to a large gathering of some 6,000 people of all political and religious faiths delivered a very significant speech which I wish to put into the RECORD. Many of us will recall his speeches to the joint sessions of Congress during the war, and none of us can forget the inspiration that he imparted to the people of Britain during the darkest days of the war. In his speech of yesterday I think he has done the same thing for the people of Europe. In the desperate circumstances in which they find themselves today I believe his speech will bring a ray of hope for the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire speech be inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, but I also should like to read, as a sample, about two paragraphs which I hope will be sufficient to induce the Members of the Senate to read Mr. Churchill's speech in its entirety. I think that it raises the most important political problem confronting not only the people of Europe but confronting this country. It has particular appropriateness, I think, to the action the Senate took yesterday in passing the relief bill. I quote the following excerpts from Mr. Churchill's speech:

Are we Europeans to become incapable, with all our tropical and colonial dependencies, with all our long-created trading connections, with all that modern production and transportation can do, of even averting famine from the mass of our peoples? Are we all, through our poverty and our quarrels, forever to be a burden and a danger to the rest of the world? Do we imagine that we can be carried forward indefinitely upon the shoulders—broad though they be—of the United States?

The time has come when these questions must be answered. This is the hour of choice, and surely the choice is plain. If the peoples of Europe resolve to come together and work together for mutual advantage, to exchange blessings instead of curses, they still have it in their power to sweep away the horrors and miseries which surround them and to allow the streams of freedom, happiness and abundance to begin again their healing flow.

It has been finely said by a young English writer, Mr. Sewell, that the real demarcation between Europe and Asia is no chain of mountains, no natural frontier, but a system of beliefs and ideas which we call western civilization.

In the rich pattern of this culture, says Mr. Sewell, there are many strands: the Hebrew belief in God; the Christian message of compassion and redemption; the Greek love of truth, beauty and goodness; the Roman genius for law. Europe is a spiritual conception. But, if men cease to hold that conception in their minds, cease to feel its worth in their hearts, it will die.

Mr. Churchill also points out, I think probably the most important question which will confront this country, our State Department and this body in the

next few weeks when he says this about Germany:

The central and almost the most serious problem which glares upon the Europe of today is the future of Germany. Without a solution of this problem, there can be no united Europe. Except within the framework and against the background of a united Europe, this problem is incapable of solution.

I think there could not be a truer statement. There is one further reference to the United States. He says:

When I first began writing about the United States of Europe some 15 years ago, I wondered whether the United States of America would regard such a development as antagonistic to their interest, or even contrary to their safety.

Mr. President, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and I submitted a resolution some weeks ago, and it seems to me that the least we can do is to give a definite answer to the doubt which still exists in the mind of Mr. Churchill, although he goes forward to say that he surely cannot believe that there is still a doubt. There is no reason whatever why this country should not lend encouragement to the accomplishment of this purpose.

I, for one, cannot understand why our Government cannot proceed to give some thought to the problem. If there are problems the solution of which will contribute to a peaceful world, this is the most important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the speech of Winston Churchill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All the greatest things are simple, and many can be expressed in a single word. Freedom; justice; honor; duty; mercy; hope. We who have come together here today, representing almost all the political parties of our British national life and nearly all the creeds and churches of the Western World—this large audience filling a famous hall—we also can express our purpose in a single word: Europe.

At school we learned, from the maps hung on the walls, that there is a continent called Europe. I remember quite well being taught this as a child, and, after living a long time, I still believe it is true. However, professional geographers now tell us that the continent of Europe is really only on the peninsula of the Asiatic land mass. I must tell you that I feel that this would be an arid and uninspiring conclusion and, for myself, I distinctly prefer what I was taught when I was a boy.

It has been finely said by a young English writer, Mr. Sewell, that the real demarcation between Europe and Asia is no chain of mountains, no natural frontier, but a system of beliefs and ideas which we call western civilization.

PATTERN OF MANY STRANDS

In the rich pattern of this culture, says Mr. Sewell, there are many strands: the Hebrew belief in God; the Christian message of compassion and redemption; the Greek love of truth, beauty, and goodness; the Roman genius for law. Europe is a spiritual conception. But, if men cease to hold that conception in their minds, cease to feel its worth in their hearts, it will die.

These are not my words, but they are my faith; and we are here to proclaim our resolve that the spiritual conception of Europe

shall not die. We declare, on the contrary, that it shall live and shine, and cast its redeeming illumination upon a world of confusion and woe.

That is what has brought us all together here this evening, and that is what is going to keep us all together—however sharply or even deeply we may be divided on many other matters—until our goal is reached and our hopes are realized.

In our task of reviving the glories and happiness of Europe, her culture, and her prosperity, it can certainly be said that we start at the bottom of her fortunes.

CITES WORLD CONTRIBUTIONS

There is the fairest, most temperate, most fertile area of the globe. The influence and the power of Europe and of Christendom have for centuries shaped and dominated the course of history. The sons and daughters of Europe have gone forth and carried their message to every part of the world. Religion, law, learning, art, science, industry throughout the world all bear in so many lands, under every sky and in every clime, the stamp of European origin and traces of European influence.

But what is Europe now? It is a rubble heap, a charnel house, a breeding ground of pestilence and hate. Ancient nationalistic feuds and modern ideological factions distract and infuriate the unhappy, hungry populations.

Evil teachers urge the paying off of old scores with mathematical precision, and false guides point to unsparring retribution as the path to prosperity.

Is there then to be no respite? Has Europe's mission come to an end? Has she nothing to give to the world but the contagion of the black death? Are her peoples to go on harrying and tormenting one another by war and vengeance until all that invests human life with dignity and comfort has been obliterated?

Are the states of Europe to continue forever to squander the first fruits of their toil upon the erection of new barriers, military fortifications and tariff walls and passport networks against one another?

DEPENDENT ON UNITED STATES

Are we Europeans to become incapable, with all our tropical and colonial dependencies, with all our long created trading connections, with all that modern production and transportation can do, of even averting famine from the mass of our peoples? Are we all, through our poverty and our quarrels, forever to be a burden and a danger to the rest of the world? Do we imagine that we can be carried forward indefinitely upon the shoulders—broad though they be—of the United States?

The time has come when these questions must be answered. This is the hour of choice and surely the choice is plain. If the peoples of Europe resolve to come together and work together for mutual advantage, to exchange blessings instead of curses, they still have it in their power to sweep away the horrors and miseries which surround them and to allow the streams of freedom, happiness, and abundance to begin again their healing flow.

This is the supreme opportunity, and if it be cast away, no one can predict that it will ever return or what the resulting catastrophe will be.

In my experience of large enterprises it is often a mistake to try to settle everything at once. Far off, on the sky line, we can see the peaks of the delectable mountains. But we cannot tell what lies between us and them.

PERSUASION, NOT ORDERS

We know where we want to go, but we cannot foresee all the stages of the journey or plan our marches as in a military operation. We are not acting in the field of forces, but in the domain of opinion. We cannot give orders. We can only persuade.

We must go forward step by step.

I will, therefore, explain in general terms where we are and what are the first things we have to do. We have now at once to set on foot an organization in Great Britain to promote the cause of United Europe and to give this idea the prominence and vitality necessary for it to lay hold of the minds of our fellow countrymen to such an extent that it will affect their actions and influence the course of national policy.

We accept, without question, the world supremacy of the United Nations organization. In the constitution agreed at San Francisco, direct provision is made for regional organizations to be formed. United Europe will form one major regional entity.

This is the United States, with all its dependencies; there is the Soviet Union; there is the British Empire and Commonwealth; and there is Europe, with which Great Britain is profoundly blended. Here are the four main pillars of the world temple of peace. Let us make sure that they will all bear the weight which will be reposed upon them.

It is not for us at this stage to attempt to define or prescribe the structure of constitutions. We ourselves are content to present the idea of united Europe, in which our country will play a decisive part, as a moral, cultural, and spiritual conception to which all can rally without divergence about structure.

It is for the responsible statesmen who have the conduct of affairs in their hands and the power of executive action to shape and fashion the structure. It is for us to lay the foundation, to create the atmosphere and to give the driving impulsion.

First I turn to France. For 40 years I have marched with France. I have shared her joys and sufferings. I rejoice in her reviving national strength. Certainly I will not abandon this long comradeship now.

But we have a proposal to make to France which will give all Frenchmen a cause for serious thought and valiant decision. If European unity is to be made an effective reality before it is too late, the wholehearted efforts, both of France and Britain, will be needed from the outset. They must go forward hand in hand. They must in fact be founder-partners in this movement.

GERMANY CENTRAL PROBLEM

The central and almost the most serious problem which glares upon the Europe of today is the future of Germany. Without a solution of this problem, there can be no united Europe. Except within the framework and against the background of a united Europe, this problem is incapable of solution.

In a continent of divided national states, Germany and her hard-working people will not find means or scope to employ their energies. Economic suffocation will inevitably turn their thoughts to revolt and revenge. Germany will once again become a menace to her neighbors and to the whole world; and the fruits of victory and liberation will be cast away.

But, on the wider stage of a united Europe, German industry and German genius would be able to find constructive and peaceful outlets. Instead of being a center of poverty and a source of danger, the German people would be enabled to bring back prosperity in no small measure, not only to themselves but to the whole continent.

Germany today lies prostrate, famishing among ruins. Obviously no initiative can be expected from her. It is for France and Britain to take the lead. Together they must, in a friendly manner, bring the German race back into the European circle.

No one can say, and we need not attempt to forecast, what will be the future constitution of Germany. Various individual German states are at present being recreated. There are the old states and principalities of the

Germany of former days to which the culture of the world owes so much.

END OF RETALIATION SEEN

Without prejudice to any future question of German federation, these individual states might well be invited to take their place in the council of Europe. Thus, in looking back to happier days, we should hope to mark the end of that long trail of hatred and retaliation which has already led us all, victors and vanquished alike, into the pit of squalor, slaughter and ruin.

The prime duty and opportunity of bringing about this essential reunion belongs to us and to our French friends across the Channel. Strong bonds of affection, mutual confidence, common interest, and similar outlook link France and Britain together.

The treaty of alliance that has lately been signed merely gives formal expression to the community of sentiment that already exists as an indisputable and indestructible fact.

It is true that this task of reconciliation requires on the part of France, who has suffered so cruelly, an act of faith, sublime in character; but it is by this act of faith and by this act of faith alone that France will regain her historic position in the leadership of Europe.

ROLE OF ITALY DISCUSSED

There is also another leading member of our ancient family of nations to be held in mind. There is Italy. Everything that I have said about the imperative need of reaching a reconciliation with the German race and the ending of the fearful quarrels that have ruined them, and almost ruined us, applies in a less difficult degree to the Italian people, who wish to dwell happily and industriously within their beautiful country and who were hurled by a dictator into the hideous struggles of the north.

I am told that this idea of a united Europe makes an intense appeal to Italians who look back across the centuries of confusion and disorder to the glories of the classic age, when a dozen legion were sufficient to preserve peace and law through vast territories and when freemen could travel freely under the sanction of a common citizenship.

We hope to reach again a Europe purged of the slavery of the ancient times in which men will be as proud to say, "I am a European" as once they were to say, "Civis Romanus sum." We hope to see a Europe where men of every country will think so much of being a European as of belonging to their native land, and wherever they go in this wide domain will truly feel: "Here I am at home." How simple it would all be, and how crowned with glory, if that were to arrive.

BOUNDARIES NOT IN ISSUE

It will next, of course, be asked: "What are the political and physical boundaries of the United Europe you are trying to create? Which countries will be in and which out?"

It is not our task or wish to draw frontier lines, but, rather, to smooth them away. Our aim is to bring about the unity of all nations of all Europe.

We seek to exclude no state whose territory lies in Europe and which assures to its people those fundamental human and personal rights and liberties on which our democratic civilization has been created.

Some countries will feel able to come into our circle sooner, and others later, according to the circumstances in which they are placed. They can all be sure that whenever they are to join, a place and a welcome will be waiting for them at the European council table.

When I first began writing about the United States of Europe some 15 years ago, I wondered whether the United States of America would regard such a development as antagonistic to their interest, or even contrary to their safety.

But all that has passed away. The whole movement of American opinion is favorable

to the revival and re-creation of Europe. This is surely not unnatural when we remember how the manhood of the United States has twice in a lifetime been forced to recross the Atlantic Ocean and pour out their treasure as the result of wars originating from ancient European feuds.

SEES AMERICAN BLESSING

One cannot be surprised that they would like to see a peaceful and united Europe taking its place in the foundations of the world organization to which they are devoted. I have no doubt that, far from encountering any opposition or prejudice from the great Republic of the New World, our movement will have their blessing and their aid.

We here in Great Britain have our own self-governing dominions—Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa. We are joined together by ties of free will which have stood unyielding against all the ups and downs of fortune.

We are the center and summit of a worldwide commonwealth of nations. It is necessary that any policy this island may adopt towards Europe should enjoy the full sympathy and approval of the peoples of the Dominions. Why should we suppose that they will not be with us in this cause? They feel with us that Britain is geographically and historically a part of Europe and that they also have their inheritance in Europe.

If Europe united is to be a living force, Britain will have to play her full part as a member of the European family.

The Dominions also know that their youth, like that of the United States, have twice in living memory traversed the immense ocean spaces to fight and die in wars brought about by European discord in the prevention of which they have been powerless.

We may be sure that the cause of united Europe, in which the mother country must be a prime mover, will in no way be contrary to the sentiments which join us all together with our Dominions in the circle of the British crown.

It is, of course, alleged that all advocacy of the ideal of united Europe is nothing but a maneuver in the game of power politics, and that it is a sinister plot against Soviet Russia. There is no truth in this.

TO PREVENT AGGRESSION

The whole purpose of a united democratic Europe is to give decisive guaranties against aggression. Looking out from the ruins of some of their most famous cities and from amid the cruel devastation of their fairest lands, the Russian people should surely realize how much they stand to gain by the elimination of the causes of war and the fear of war on the European continent.

The creation of a healthy and contented Europe is the first and truest interest of the Soviet Union. We had therefore hoped that all sincere efforts to promote European agreement and stability would receive, as they deserve, the sympathy and support of Russia. Instead, all this beneficent design has been denounced and viewed with suspicion by the Soviet press and radio. We have made no retort, and I do not propose to do so tonight.

But neither could we accept the claim that the veto of a single power, however respected, should bar and prevent a movement necessary to the peace, amity and well-being of so many hundreds of millions of toiling and striving men and women.

We see before our eyes hundreds of millions of humble homes in Europe and islands outside which would be affected by war. Are they never to have a chance to thrive and flourish? Is the honest, faithful bread-winner never to be able to reap the fruits of his labor? Can he never bring up his children in health and joy and with the hopes of better days?

PERILS TO BE ELIMINATED

Can he never be free from the fear of foreign invasion, the crash of the bomb or the

shell, the tramp of the hostile patrol or, what is even worse, the knock upon his door of the secret political police to take away the loved one far from the protection of law and justice; when, all the time, by one spontaneous effort of his will, he could wake from all these nightmare horrors and stand forth in his manhood, free in the broad light of day?

The conception of European unity already commands strong sympathy among the leading statesmen in almost all countries. Europe must federate or perish, said the present Prime Minister, Mr. Attlee, before the late terrible war; and I have no reason to suppose that he will abandon that presidential declaration at a time when the vindication of his words is at hand.

Of course, we understand that, until public opinion expresses itself more definitely, governments hesitate to take positive action. It is for us to provide the proof of solid popular support, both here and abroad, which will give to the governments of Europe a confidence to go forward and give practical effect to their beliefs.

URGES BROADER VIEWPOINT

We cannot say how long it will be before this stage is reached. We ask, however, that in the meantime His Majesty's government, together with other governments, should approach the various pressing continental problems from a European rather than from a restricted national angle.

In the discussions on the German and Austrian peace settlements, and indeed throughout the whole diplomatic field, the ultimate ideal should be held in view. Every new arrangement that is made should be designed in such a manner as to be capable of later being fitted into the pattern of a United Europe.

I must end where I began, namely, by placing this immense design of Europe within and subordinate to the United Nations organization. Unless some effective world supergovernment, for the purposes of preventing war, can be set up and begin its reign, the prospects for peace and human progress are dark and doubtful.

But let there be no mistake upon one point. Without a united Europe there is no prospect of world government. It is the urgent and indispensable step toward the realization of that ideal.

EARLIER FAILURE CITED

After the first great war the League of Nations tried to build, without the aid of the United States, an international order upon a weak, divided Europe. Its failure cost us dear.

Today, after the Second World War, Europe is far weaker and still more distracted. One of the four main pillars of the temple of peace lies before us in shattered fragments. It must be assembled and reconstructed before there can be any real progress in building a spacious superstructure of our desires.

If, during the next 5 years, it is found possible to build a world organization of irresistible force and inviolable authority for the purpose of securing peace, there are no limits to the blessings which all men may enjoy and share. Nothing will help forward the building of that world organization so much as unity and stability in a Europe that is conscious of her collective personality and resolved to assume her rightful part in guiding the unfolding destinies of man.

In the ordinary day-to-day affairs of life, men and women expect rewards for successful exertion, and this is often right and reasonable. But those who serve causes as majestic and high as ours need no reward; nor are our aims limited by the span of human life.

If success comes to us soon, we shall be happy. If our purpose is delayed, if we are confronted by obstacles and inertia, we may still be of good cheer, because in a cause, the righteousness of which will be proclaimed

by the march of future events and the judgment of happier ages, we shall have done our duty and done our best.

BRITISH COTTON BILL SET FOR KING'S SIGNATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I rise to read into the Record a news release from London dated May 13 and issued by the Associated Press. This item was carried in the New York Herald Tribune of May 14. It reads as follows:

BRITISH COTTON BILL SET FOR KING'S SIGNATURE

LONDON, May 13.—Except for the formality of King George's assent, a bill banning private importation of cotton and closing down the famed Liverpool Cotton Exchange became law tonight.

The bill, already passed by the Commons, was given final passage in the Lords without a vote after Conservative Lord Rea, leading a last futile attack against the measure, declared 80 percent of Britain's cotton spinners opposed it.

I wish to recall for the record that I voted against the British loan because the Senate was unwilling to write in reservations which would require credit balances to be canceled in the event that Great Britain used any of the funds to the detriment of the United States.

THE TRUMAN DOCTRINE—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "The Truman Doctrine," delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, before the Optimist Club of Topeka, Kans., on May 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the record an article relating to a bill introduced by him and Representative Brown of Ohio providing for reorganization of executive branch of the Government, written by George E. Sokolsky, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of May 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE MOBILE REGISTER

[Mr. ELLENDER (for Mr. OVERTON), asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "New Drive To Sink Vast Federal Fund in Part-Time St. Lawrence Waterway," published in the Mobile (Ala.) Register of May 10, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Aviation may be permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, consent is granted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be absent tomorrow on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the leave is granted.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I submit a conference report, and ask

unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted in the House amendment insert the following:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may from time to time when he deems it in the interest of the United States furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him—

"(1) by rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries;

"(2) by detailing to assist those countries any persons in the employ of the Government of the United States; and the provisions of the Act of May 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 442), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such Act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided, however*, That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this Act until such personnel have been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

"(3) by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the Act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such Act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;

"(4) by providing for (A) the transfer to, and the procurement for by manufacture or otherwise and the transfer to, those countries of any articles, services, and information, and (B) the instruction and training of personnel of those countries; and

"(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 2. (a) Sums from advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) and from the appropriations made under authority of section 4 (b) may be allocated for any of the purposes of this Act to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government. Any amount so allocated shall be available as advancement or reimbursement, and shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, to appropriate appropriations, funds, or accounts existing or established for the purpose.

"(b) Whenever the President requires payment in advance by the Government of Greece or of Turkey for assistance to be furnished to such countries in accordance with this Act, such payments when made shall be credited to such countries in accounts established for the purpose. Sums from such accounts shall be allocated to the departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government which furnish the assistance for which payment is received, in the same manner, and shall be available and credited in the same manner, as allocations made under subsection (a) of this section. Any portion of such allocation

not used as reimbursement shall remain available until expended.

"(c) Whenever any portion of an allocation under subsection (a) or subsection (b) is used as reimbursement, the amount of reimbursement shall be available for entering into contracts and other uses during the fiscal year in which the reimbursement is received and the ensuing fiscal year. Where the head of any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government determines that replacement of any article transferred pursuant to paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d) (1) Payment in advance by the Government of Greece or of Turkey shall be required by the President for any articles or services furnished to such country under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 if they are not paid for from funds advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) or from funds appropriated under authority of section 4 (b).

"(2) No department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government shall furnish any articles or services under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 to either Greece or Turkey, unless it receives advancements or reimbursements therefor out of allocations under subsection (a) or (b) of this section.

"Sec. 3. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this Act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to permit free access of United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether such assistance is utilized effectively and in accordance with the undertakings of the recipient government; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; (c) not to transfer, without the consent of the President of the United States, title to or possession of any article or information transferred pursuant to this Act nor to permit, without such consent, the use of any such article or the use or disclosure of any such information by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the recipient government; (d) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this Act; (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of aid rendered pursuant to this Act for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government; and (f) to give full and continuous publicity within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of United States economic assistance carried on therein pursuant to this Act.

"Sec. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate \$100,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this Act, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed \$400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. From appropriations made under this authority there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under subsection (a) of this section.

"Sec. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act, and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him pursuant to this Act through such

department, agency, independent establishment, or officer of the Government as he shall direct.

"The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

"(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;

"(2) If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable;

"(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the Act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the Act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment; and

"(4) If the President finds that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out.

"Sec. 6. Assistance to any country under this Act may, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated by concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress.

"Sec. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities, which shall include uses of funds by the recipient governments, under authority of this Act.

"Sec. 8. The chief of any mission to any country receiving assistance under this Act shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of this Act as the President shall prescribe."

And the House agree to the same.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CHARLES A. EATON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
SOL BLOOM,
JOHN KEE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is a unanimous report from the conferees, and I shall make a brief statement respecting it. The report has just been adopted by the House of Representatives.

The bill as it comes from conference is practically in the form in which it was passed by the Senate. The bill passed by the House did not include provision for confirmation of the administrators by the Senate. The conference report does include such a provision.

The bill as it passed the House did not contain the correct version of the so-called Vandenberg amendment respecting the United Nations. The House recedes, and the conference report bill contains the formula contained in the Senate bill.

In addition, the Senate conferees have agreed to the following three additional restrictions put into the bill by the House:

First. Provision for investigations of personnel by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Second. Provision for termination of the act by concurrent resolution of the Congress whenever Congress so wills.

Third. Provision for termination of the act if the President finds any of the requirements of the act not being carried out.

About the only change in the bill as it passed the Senate was the elimination of the so-called Johnson amendment, which provided that, "Nothing in this act shall be construed to imply that the Government of the United States shall be bound to support private agreements made between American oil companies and foreign governments or between American oil companies and nationals of foreign governments."

It was the position of the House conferees and a majority of the Senate conferees that no such agreements can by any stretch of the imagination be considered to exist now or to be in contemplation, and that therefore this particular amendment was unnecessary.

Otherwise, I repeat, the conference bill is practically in the form of the bill passed by the Senate, plus the acceptance by the Senate of the three additional protections as provided in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to express my approval of the conference report. Substantially it contains all the vital matters the Senate bill embraced. While I personally disagree with one provision, to the effect that the act can be terminated by concurrent resolution, which I do not think would be legally effective, I shall not press that matter. I agree to the conference report, and I trust the Senate will adopt it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the pending legislation, if we shall be successful in having it passed by the Senate today, and perhaps passed tomorrow by the House of Representatives, may well be one of the most important pieces of legislation enacted during the present session of Congress. It may be recalled by Members of this body that the proposed legislation is not of recent origin. The subject has been studied for the past two and a half years by many Senators on both sides of the aisle, by many of the scientists of the Nation, and by prominent lay persons and prominent Government officials.

The bill comes to the Senate from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

with a unanimous report. There are some slight differences of opinion regarding certain features of the bill, but the basic principles are agreed upon by practically everyone.

A year ago when the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I, together with other Senators, held hearings on the legislation similar to this we interviewed approximately 150 witnesses—I believe 151, to be exact. Those witnesses, Mr. President, included all the eminent scientists of America, prominent businessmen, Government officials, Cabinet officers, and practically everyone we could think of in high place in the economic and scientific life of America. Of the 151 witnesses, 150 testified in favor of the basic principles of the legislation. Of course, during the testimony suggestions were made by many of the witnesses regarding certain features of the bill. After the hearings were concluded we sat down and tried to frame a bill which would more or less coincide with the ideas of all those prominent people, including Government officials, Cabinet officers, and Members of Congress. We were successful in doing so, and after about 4 days' debate in the early part of last summer the bill passed the Senate by practically unanimous vote. In the closing days of the session it was lost in the House, not because the members of the House committee or Members of the House did not favor the bill as it was written, with minor amendments, but because the pressure of legislative business at the close of the session was such that the House adjourned before it could take action.

Now the new Congress has again taken up the legislation. It was wisely suggested by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that we hold no further hearings on the matter but that the House committee hold hearings, because last year the House committee did not interview and hear all these witnesses. The House has done so, and I think I can say without fear of misunderstanding the situation, that the House committee is also ready to report a bill somewhat in the form of the pending Senate bill.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from New Jersey gave the Senate a very careful résumé of the bill. As I previously pointed out, many other Senators have made a thorough study of the legislation. The only feature which has been added to the legislation is the very vital and important subject of cancer and cancer research in the United States. Personally I am somewhat familiar with that subject and legislation dealing with it, including the new feature placed in the pending bill, because approximately 10 years ago the then distinguished senior Senator from my State, now a member of the circuit court of appeals in San Francisco, former Senator Bone, and I introduced a bill to establish a cancer institute, which now exists in Maryland. That cancer institute has been operating for approximately 20 years with a great deal of success. It might be well to note that of all the appropriations dealt with by the House, the only appropriation which has been voluntarily increased is

that made for the cancer institute in Maryland. However, in several discussions held recently, those of us interested in the bill, both in Congress and outside of Congress, have decided that we might well incorporate in the National Science Foundation the broad purposes of cancer research, and not only cancer research, Mr. President, but research into heart disease and, if you please, the common cold, and many other diseases and ailments which reduce the human life span.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan said recently during a floor debate, "You cannot drive the scientists into their laboratories"; but, Mr. President, we in Congress can provide a common meeting ground and an adequate facility wherein a free science, both within and without the Government, can come together voluntarily and in the interests of humanity plan a mass attack on those problems of science and medicine which have not yet jelled to our best efforts.

Science, medicine, and their lifeblood, education, have taxed their existing resources to keep pace with our complex civilization and our expanding frontiers. The individual efforts must continue to be encouraged, but where the problem requires Nation-wide effort and facility, the resources of individual or even group effort are inadequate.

President Roosevelt recognized this in 1939 and 1940 when he created the National Defense Research Committee headed by Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, and later the Office of Scientific Research and Development directed by Dr. Vannevar Bush. I could recite at length the brilliant record of secret weapon development within these agencies from the atomic bomb to the commercial development of DDT and penicillin.

Mr. President, these were wartime agencies operating under wartime conditions to mobilize science for war. When peace was at hand, President Roosevelt in a letter dated November 17, 1944, requested Dr. Bush to report on a program for postwar scientific research. Once again, the Government turned to science for peacetime guidance of our scientific future. Dr. Bush and his colleagues and the eminent scientists of America prepared a report for submission to President Roosevelt. After President Roosevelt's death the report was submitted to President Truman. Copies of it are on the desks of all Senators. The report is well worth reading. The broad and basic principles of the bill are founded upon the report.

Mr. President, I know of no legislation in my experience where the testimony of so many outstanding men in every walk of life were in agreement. Federal aid to basic research and a scholarship program were unanimously recommended by these men in answer to the Government's desire to provide for a postwar scientific program.

We cannot stand by and allow our world scientific leadership to be frittered away. Less than two-thirds of 1 percent of our national income goes into research and only one-third of one-tenth of 1 percent of our national income goes into

basic research, I doubt if any business, large or small, can gain or maintain leadership in the future, whether it be domestically or in the world, with so little investment.

Mr. President, Dr. Bush in his report, *Science the Endless Frontier*, estimated last year that the country needed to have 17,000 more persons trained in the basic sciences. I do not know what the figure is this year, but I suspect that if an estimate were made, it would be even larger.

We in this country adopted a very short-sighted policy during the war. Instead of permitting youngsters with inquisitive minds and those who were scientifically bent to proceed with their training as basic scientists, we took them into the Army and made no exceptions. No other country in the world engaged in the war adopted such a policy. Russia, Germany, Japan, England, Canada, and even Australia said to their youngsters who were scientifically inclined "Go into a laboratory. That is your part of the war effort." Several of us, aided and abetted by those on the outside who saw the short-sightedness of this policy, attempted to change it. We even went to the extent of offering amendments to the military conscription bills whereby scientifically trained men or youngsters with scientifically inquisitive minds might be exempted from military duty to carry on their scientific training and education. We never succeeded until near the end of the demobilization period. The result is that this country in proportion to its population has fewer basic scientists than any of the other countries in the world, including even some of the so-called backward countries. We cannot expect to keep pace with the rest of the world scientifically, whether it be in military science or domestic science, unless we adopt a national policy such as is embodied in this bill.

I need not point out that the potency of the German war machine was due mainly to the fact that long prior to the war—even long prior to World War I—and all during the period between World War I and World War II—Germany made a special attempt to train her young scientists and to subsidize applied science. I might even suggest that if the German population, with its scientific policy, could conceivably have been living in this country, with its great potential economic and national resources, probably we might not have won the war.

During the war Russia made special cases of her scientific personnel. We have had a complete hiatus—a twilight zone—for seven long years, without the training of a sufficient number of basic scientists in this country. The result is that today even in private and Government research we are having the greatest difficulty in recruiting young men and women who can apply basic science to our problems.

So this bill is important. There will probably be offered four major amendments which the Senate should examine carefully. It must be remembered that we are entering a new field. The Senate should realize that for the first time, aside from the Cancer Research Insti-

tute created by the so-called Bone-Magnuson bill 10 years ago, and research within some of the departments, such as the Bureau of Mines and the Department of Agriculture, the Government of the United States is embarking upon a new program. The Government is entering the field of scientific research. As was well pointed out yesterday by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, it is not intended that the Foundation shall operate any Government plants. As a matter of fact, there is a prohibition in the bill against the Foundation, if it is established, operating any plants whatsoever. It will be a policy-making board. The most important and major part of the bill is that the Government will say, "We are going to see that there are a sufficient number of basic scientists in the United States to keep America abreast of the scientific world."

Qualifications for scholarships and fellowships will be determined by the Foundation, but the Foundation itself will not establish any plants. It will say to private institutions and Government agencies, "Here is the problem. Here is the scientific policy of America, as we see it. We are going to aid you in solving the problem for the welfare of the whole country." That problem may be in medicine, in biology, or even in social sciences. Surely the Foundation can be of great aid in military science. The Foundation will in no way interfere with the present research plans of the Army, the Navy, or any other Government agency. As a matter of fact, the governmental agencies are so convinced that the Foundation will supplement and assist their activities that every agency has endorsed the bill as it now stands.

Some question was raised by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as to whether or not the Foundation would interfere with the policies laid down by Congress in the Atomic Energy Act. He has proposed an amendment, which will be satisfactory to most of us who sponsored the bill, whereby there will be no conflict between the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Science Foundation for a great deal of its research.

Another amendment will be offered, with respect to which there will probably be considerable argument. There is a basic difference as to how the Foundation should be administered. Some would like to have a director appointed directly by the President, and then have an advisory board of scientists and eminent laymen to direct his policy, or at least suggest to him the policy. There are others who would like to have a board appointed, and have the board appoint its own executive director. In order not to impair the basic principles of the bill, we have attempted to arrive at a compromise. I believe that one plan is just as good as the other, depending upon the men who are behind it. The latest suggestion is to have a board appointed in accordance with the provisions of the bill, and have the director also appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to carry out the policies of the board.

The fourth amendment will be offered by the distinguished Senator from Ohio

[Mr. TAFT] and myself. It will include cancer in the research purview of the National Science Foundation. I should like to say a word for the RECORD on that subject. I am somewhat familiar with the problem of cancer research, and with the legislative policy—if we have had a policy—regarding cancer research.

Scientists tell us that sometimes too much money is detrimental to research. As I pointed out earlier, the House increased the appropriation for the National Cancer Institute at Bethesda from approximately \$1,750,000 to about \$27,000,000. In the meantime there is a private drive so far as cancer research is concerned, led by a very fine group of citizens who have banded themselves together and called themselves the American Cancer Society. They have recently conducted a very successful drive throughout the country. If the \$27,000,000 appropriation should stand, it would probably channel too much of the cancer research into a Government institution. It was thought that the wiser course to follow would be to reduce the appropriation recommended by the House to approximately \$7,000,000, which the Cancer Institute can well use, and which will adequately provide for its program, and to establish a cancer division under the National Science Foundation, which would correlate the Government activities with those of private institutions and the American Cancer Society.

As one of the so-called fathers of the Institute, I think that is a wise course. The American Cancer Institute tells us that it has plenty of funds to carry on its program as far as it can go. It has not sufficient personnel efficiently to spend all its funds. It is encouraging young men and women to enter private institutions or the Government Cancer Research Institute and there participate in the attack on this dreaded disease, which kills at least 3 people every minute in this country, a disease from which 17,000,000 Americans now walking the streets of American will die, regardless of what we do in this bill or what is done by the Cancer Institute. Seventeen million Americans today have cancer, and probably 16,000,000 of them are not aware of it.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and I, hope that by providing for cancer research by the Foundation all cancer research work can be coordinated.

It is also hoped that with the aid of Government funds, private funds, and such funds as we may be able to secure elsewhere we can successfully combat our first great killer, heart disease. An over-all America, through this bill, if it is enacted, will take cognizance of and attack the entire field of scientific problems.

I think that 10 years from now that this legislation may well be considered the most important passed by the Congress at its present session. I hope there will not be too much controversy over the phases of organization and some of the amendments which will be proposed, because, basically, we are all trying to move in the same direction. It is high time we did, because it will be from 7 to 10 years before there will be trained in

this country a sufficient number of basic scientists to carry forward an adequate scientific program.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate the Senator upon his very comprehensive and very clear exposition of the bill. I had not heretofore given the matter much thought or study, and I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I do not wish to proceed further, but I think I should say that this bill also has great defense implications. Whether atomic energy will be the great defense weapon of America I do not know. There is such a thing as bacteriological warfare. It has never been explored. There is such a thing as keeping America defensively strong by protecting and improving public health. That is a subject which we have gone into, but not adequately. There may be, which God forbid, such a thing as another attack on America waged wholly along scientific lines. There is such a thing as placing two or three men in a laboratory and having them help more in the defense and welfare of this country than would 10,000 men marching up and down a parade field.

This bill is at least an approach to the objective. I hope the Senate today will see fit to put its stamp of approval upon this piece of legislation which many of us have thought about and labored over for a long time and which has practically the unanimous approval, I am sure, of all the citizens of America. As the Senator from New Jersey pointed out, we hope to start modestly. We may ask for approximately \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000, and surely, with all the money America is spending for other things—such an appropriation would not be unreasonable. The sum we are asking is not so much as the cost of one heavy cruiser—but the fruits within the first year of the life of this Foundation, will be worth to America, the cost of many cruisers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 3 (a), in line 2, on page 2, it is proposed to strike out "forty-eight" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-four."

FREEDOM OF NEWS IN THE WORLD

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we have during the four previous sessions of Congress considered many problems, including the legislation which was passed yesterday, which involved the destiny and welfare of nations and a lasting peace in the world.

One of the most important problems in the world today is the free and unfettered exchange of news and information among the peoples and the nations of the world. It is a problem to which men of good will have addressed themselves for many years in the belief that if citizens of every country knew their neighbors better, the chances for differences between them would diminish.

For centuries men of vision have pursued this ideal. In ancient Greece, Plato and Socrates advocated spreading the culture of their land by encouraging students to travel widely; in later times, Britain's great empire builder, Cecil Rhodes, established a system of scholarships in England with the purpose of making Americans know England and English ways better.

At no time in the history of the world is this need for a freer and more complete interchange of news and information among nations more necessary than today. It is needless to emphasize that this is the atomic age, the age of guided missiles and rockets, the age when misunderstandings between peoples may lead to speedy destruction—even annihilation. It is an age when it is vitally important to the people of every land that they know from day to day, from hour to hour, what goes on in the world, that they know the truth—or as much of the truth as it is possible to know.

Men talk about iron curtains in the world. The iron curtain that is a bar to understanding, a shield for intrigue and trouble, is the curtain of perverted and false information about other men and nations. One of the great accomplishments of the United Nations can be to tear down that iron curtain—to allow mankind the world over to learn the truth because the truth will set them free.

Here in the United States we have a free press. It is as free as mankind can make it in the kind of economic society in which we live. It is true that the owner or publisher of a periodical cannot be compelled to print what he does not want to print. But it is also true that there has been builded up great news-gathering and news-distributing agencies whose principal function is to assemble the news of the world and distribute it among publishers. In a competitive society, we have at least the assurance that some publishers will publish honestly the news that is made available to them each day. Actually, the overwhelming majority of publishers do so.

For many years I have been interested in this problem of the gathering and distribution of news. Particularly have I been interested in the distribution of American news in foreign lands, and conversely in the foreign news distributed in America. Long before I came to the Senate, during visits to Europe, I made it my business to look into this situation, to study European newspapers for their American news content, and American newspapers for their European news content. Later, as I have visited Europe and the Orient, I sought to keep informed on this subject.

I believe, and I am sure that every Member of the Senate agrees with me, that if every literate person in every country on earth had the opportunity, day by day, to know what goes on in this country to know what we say and what we think, how we live, and to understand us by observing us in our folkways and in our daily lives, our negotiations with the representatives of other lands would be easier and more satisfactory to both parties. Similarly, if we too knew more about some of our foreign

friends, our Russian friends, for example, whose land covers such a vast proportion of the earth's surface, and whose people are of so varied a kind and complexity—if, I repeat, we could know more about them, their daily lives, what they think, how they live, we could make a great deal more progress in dealing with their representatives over the counsel table.

I mention these matters because I believe the Senate will be very much interested in a situation I ran into in Australia in the course of a recent survey trip on Pacific communications installations and problems.

I mention this not by way of criticism but as an example of how a free flow of American news does not exist in a friendly nation like Australia—a nation which we in America regard as one of our best friends. If our two nations cannot have a free flow of news, how can we expect other nations to understand us or we them?

News from the United States destined for Australia—or, for that matter, destined for any overseas part of the British Commonwealth of Nations—gets there via Montreal and London in the majority of cases, because it may be cheaper and is always more expeditious to handle that way. It would be a good deal cheaper if American press had the full advantage of the so-called Empire rate of 1 penny a word—approximately 1.68 cents at the present rate of exchange. Let me explain that the Empire rate is a device whereby all members of the British Commonwealth of Nations enjoy exclusively among themselves a low international communications rate. As a matter of convenience, the Associated Press, the United Press, or the International News Service transmit their news destined for Australia first to Montreal, where it is transmitted overseas through the facilities of the British communications monopoly, known as Cables & Wireless, to London, and eventually to the Amalgamated Wireless of Australasia, a central, government-controlled agency, which operates the only commercial radio service into Australia and manufactures telecommunications equipment. Until recently the Australian Government owned 51 percent of the stock of that company; it is now purchasing complete ownership of the radio services of the company, and these will be managed by a recently established telecommunications commission. It is illegal to distribute to the press of Australia any material that is not received via this Amalgamated Wireless, and it is also illegal to rebroadcast in Australia any voice material from overseas which is not picked up by Amalgamated. This agency, therefore, is the chosen instrument monopoly through which news must flow.

The recipient of all foreign news in Australia is an agency known as Australian Associated Press, in no way, of course, connected with our own AP. Until last year the Australian Associated Press had exclusive contracts with AP, UP, and Reuters. Its contract with American AP, for example, entitled it to access to the complete daily AP news file.

From that file the Australian Associated Press bureau in New York excerpts about 5,000 words a day for transmission to Melbourne, where it is picked up by Amalgamated Wireless and delivered to the main Australian Associated Press office. The Australian AP, in turn, distributes this news file in two ways: First, the complete file to its member newspapers in Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Adelaide, and Perth; a condensed file to nonmember country papers, which buy the service but have no voice in the agency's management; second, an even more condensed file, known to newspapermen as a "pony service," to the New Zealand Press Association. Except for the newspapers owned by Ezra Norton, who publishes two papers, and who is not a member of the Australian Associated Press, the entire daily press of Australia is wholly dependent for its American news upon this one source. What actually does this mean, as a practical matter?

First, far less than 5,000 words of American news gets into Australia daily, simply because in the case of the United Press, International News Service, and even Associated Press files, the first condensation in New York is further condensed in Melbourne before transmission to member newspapers.

Secondly, the condensation, of course, may frequently result in distorted American news dispatches made available to Australian editors for publication. I do not say this in criticism of Australian newspapers or their employees; but the plain fact is that in any condensation of news, parts of a story are omitted, and what remains does not present a true story. This is the fact about American news in Australia. Perhaps it is because news of the more sensational events that occur in another country makes more readable news. I certainly would not want to charge that it is because the Australians are Empire-minded and want the Empire to present a better picture to their readers than our country does. But I think it is important to point out that the effect is the same. For example, when I was in Australia last December, Atlanta, Ga., experienced its disastrous Winecoff Hotel fire. There was no other American news than this in the Australian dailies; and headlines not only told of the awful tragedy but insert stories made clear that nothing like that could happen in Australian cities. On that latter point, I make no comment, except to point out that I specifically asked about fire escapes in the hotel I stayed and in two or three famous eating places, and learned there were none.

Thirdly, on a reciprocal basis, the American Associated Press is supposed to have access to the Australian Associated Press news file. The joker here is that there is no Australian news file. The Australian AP has no news-gathering staff or facilities of its own. Unlike AP or UP in this country, it is not a channel for exchanging Australian news among Australian newspapers. Its exclusive function is to "cannibalize" material gathered from its offices in New York and London. What this means is that we in America know little of what

is happening day by day in Australia.

I think it is important to point out here that neither the Australian people nor its present government are wholly responsible for this situation. The Australian people are friendly to the United States; they like our ways and our standards. Many of our boys have married Australian girls, and are staying there; many of their girls have married our men, and have come here to live. More and more Australia and Australian businessmen realize that strategically and economically their best bet is the United States. The war brought that home to them. Of course, the ties to the Empire are strong; they have been building up for more than a century; they are being assiduously cultivated today. For example, Australia is on an "austerity" diet, which means other commodities, as well as food. In a land where meat, milk, and vegetables are available in tremendous quantities; where wool, leather, and other commodities are available for export; and where citizens have money to spend, a program is pushed to largely restrict exports except to England, and to avoid purchases until the Empire can supply the commodities and luxury items that Australian people want and can afford to buy. For example, I am informed that the only deep-freeze in the entire Commonwealth is owned by the American ambassador. The American ambassador's automobile is the only one like it in Australia, and is the cynosure of all eyes, and crowds gather to look at it and admire it. I want to add that Ambassador Robert Butler is a real American ambassador, as American as corn bread, and proud of it. He is a friendly, aggressive American businessman, anxious to cement American-Australian relations and build up business between the two countries. Our former Secretary of State Byrnes is to be complimented on his choice, and if Ambassador Butler is typical of the new blood in the American State Department, I can only say that this country owes Mr. Byrnes a rising vote of thanks for making our State Department an agency of Government of which we can all be proud.

But to return to the press problem: What is the answer; what are American news agencies seeking to do about it; how successful are they in their efforts?

From November 21 to December 4, 1945, was held the British-American Telecommunications Conference in Bermuda. At the conference, America, Canada, and the United Kingdom agreed to permit private reception of multiple-address newscasts. All countries of the Western Hemisphere, the Philippines, Japan, almost every part of the Orient, Sweden, Switzerland, and Italy also permit this. These multiple-address newscasts are simply the broadcast of a large amount of press copy, beamed at a particular geographical area. Newspaper subscribers of some designated agency of the newspaper copies that part of the news broadcast of interest to that portion of the area which they serve. For example, a broadcast from the United States may be relayed via Hawaii and beamed to the entire Orient from Korea

on the north to Singapore on the south. Subscriber newspapers in Japan copy that portion of the newscast they want; Shanghai or Hong Kong newspapers copy what they want, newspapers in the Malay States or Singapore copy what they desire. Obviously, this is a cheap method of transmitting news, assuming the transmitting or receiving agency charges the subscriber a fair rate and only for that portion that he copies.

At the Bermuda conference, Australia agreed to these multiple-address newscasts, but with a reservation which made its Government-owned telegraph administration the sole receiver and retained the power to exercise its discretion as to the granting of permission to private recipients for the reception of such newscasts through their own installations or other private installation.

Note how this reservation has worked to prevent the American news services from getting into Australia with American news, or getting any substantial volume of Australian news to this country. The AP and UP sought to bring into practical application the Bermuda agreement. Strange to say, to a degree, they were aided in their efforts by the Australian Government's own broadcasting system, a government-owned and operated system which is anxious to have access to a large volume of American news for rebroadcast in its news broadcasts in Australia. But Amalgamated Wireless, the government-controlled communications agency, began by quoting a rate of a penny a word—the same as the Empire press rate. After discussion they lowered this to 3 farthings, and finally to 2 farthings per word. In other words, they started at 1½ cents a word, and came down to 6½ mills a word. On the surface, this may seem more than reasonable. But the rub is that an Australian newspaper or the radio-broadcasting system actually would find usable only from 20 to 40 percent of the total newscast, simply because a great deal of the total daily newscast is of no interest to Australian readers. For example, apart from tennis, boxing, or horse racing, American sports news is not followed in Australia, while baseball and football stories are avidly read in Japan and China. It is obvious, therefore, that if only one-fifth of the news is used and the newspaper has to pay 6½ mills per word for this entire broadcast, the usable portion actually costs almost 3½ cents a word—a prohibitive rate.

Both the AP and UP have made alternative suggestions to accomplish the objective of getting news into Australia, even offering to guarantee that the income to the Government would not be less than under the existing system. Numerous proposals have been made to the Overseas Telecommunications Commission of the Commonwealth, and in December, when I was in Sydney, the AP and UP were still waiting for an answer.

It seemed to me, when AP and UP, as well as our State Department representatives, told me the story I have just related to the Senate, that the official position of the United States Government is simply this: We are not interested in exclusive privileges; we seek no special concessions for American news agencies.

We ask only that the peoples of other nations have the same free access to American news which our people have to the news of other nations, and, conversely, that the American people have the same free access to the news of other nations that they have to American news. For example, Reuters, the principal British news agency, has many clients here in the United States who contract directly with it for the complete Reuters service on the same basis on which they would buy from AP or UP.

On this basis, and because during my service in the Senate I have taken an active interest in communications matters, I acceded to the request of AP and UP representatives, as well as the State Department press officer, and conferred with Mr. James Malone, chairman of the Australian Telecommunications Commission. Mr. Malone is an intelligent, courteous, and charming gentleman. I explained to him our concern about world press freedom; my belief that we cannot get a balanced presentation of American life in the Australian press so long as virtually all news about the United States flows through the single channel of the Australian Associated Press, which is not a governmental agency. I suggested that if American news agencies were permitted to bring their news files into Australia and distribute them there, it would not only multiply by several times the volume and variety of American news but would also probably cause the existing agency to strengthen its own American coverage.

I discussed with him the urgent necessity, in the kind of world in which we are living, of having as free and complete an interchange of news and opinion among nations as possible. He agreed with me that many of America's and Britain's problems with Russia would iron out far more readily if British and American correspondents could report all the news from the Soviet and if Soviet newspapers carried a greater proportion of American and British news. I emphasized that we in America have no desire to tell newspaper publishers and editors what to publish; that we do not do that in the United States. But what we are fighting for is the opportunity for editors to have on their desks each day more world news.

When we were about through, I inquired what the position of the Telecommunications Commission was on this subject, reminding him that our concern was chiefly that Australia put into practical application the Bermuda telecommunications agreement. He replied the matter was under study, but that the final decision was to be made in London by the Imperial Telecommunications Commission.

I have made this factual report to the Senate, not alone because the problem of relations with Australia is important to both our countries; not alone because I believe that the free interchange of news among nations is a keystone to peaceful relations among nations, but because it points up again the basic problem with which some of us here in the Senate have been concerned for some years—the problem of American international communications and the diffi-

culty in meeting the competition of a world-wide single British Empire communications system.

Our communications companies are not at fault. Neither in management nor technique are we behind. On the contrary, we emerged from the war paramount in communications equipment, techniques, and know-how. No other country was even close to us.

The basic fault is the lack of a clear, well-defined, all-embracing American international communications policy. Such a policy cannot be created alone by the Congress. In large part, it must be shaped by the Executive, although in implementing it, the Congress will have much to say.

The Senate should know that in the last stages of the war, this Nation owned and operated the finest, fastest, and most modern communications system ever known in the world, built at tremendous cost in blood and money. It included the finest world-wide airways communications service possible. That system is largely gone—junked, torn up, stolen, sold as surplus, or given away. At the height of the war it was relatively safe to fly even in the most remote parts of the world. Today, in the words of General MacArthur, it has become dangerous to fly. Ask air transport people, ask Army and Navy air transport, ask communications experts just what flying is like west and south of Hawaii, in Alaska, or east of Paris or Frankfurt.

There was a time, scarcely a year ago, when this Nation had the power and the ability to negotiate with the nations of the world for a world-circling airways communications service, not necessarily owned or even operated by the United States, but a cooperative enterprise which could have been taken over as a going business. That day is gone; the opportunity has been lost. The millions that we spent to build and operate the system are thrown away; even more important, the world is paying in lives lost in aircraft accidents, a fearful cost for that lost opportunity. We had the chance, too, of building up a world-wide commercial communications enterprise; an enterprise that would insure the prompt delivery at relatively low cost of American businessmen's messages throughout the world, safely and securely; of American diplomatic and military messages, securely and promptly. We had the chance to establish almost overnight a permanent peacetime system of communications which could have been our good right arm in times of emergency or war.

I wonder, Mr. President, how long we will sit back and wait; how long we are going to continue to attend conferences and wind up low man on the totem pole.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana suggests the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was about to ask recognition that I might make the point of no quorum. If I have recognition, I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana suggests the absence of a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoe	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eaton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Young
Hawkes	Morse	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the first committee amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "have" to strike out "forty-eight" and insert "twenty-four."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendments were, in section 3, on page 2, line 5, after the word "be", to strike out "outstanding"; in line 7, after the word "the", to strike out

"fundamental"; in the same line, after the word "sciences", to strike out "medical science"; after line 16, to insert "Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "twelve" and insert "six"; in the same line, after the word "years", to strike out "twelve" and insert "six"; in line 4, after the words "four years", to strike out "twelve" and insert "six"; and at the end of the same line, to strike out "twelve" and insert "six", so as to make the section read:

MEMBERSHIP OF FOUNDATION

SEC. 3. (a) The Foundation shall have 24 members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The persons nominated for appointment as members (1) shall be men and women who are recognized leaders in the fields of the sciences, engineering, education, or public affairs; (2) shall be selected solely on the basis of established records of distinguished service and without regard to political, social, or religious factors; and (3) shall be so selected as to provide representation of the views of scientific leaders in all areas of the Nation. The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nominations which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

(b) The term of office of each member of the Foundation shall be 8 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, six at the end of 2 years, six at the end of 4 years, six at the end of 6 years, and six at the end of 8 years, after the date of enactment of this act. No person who has served as a member of the Foundation for more than 4 years shall be eligible for reappointment as a member until the expiration of 4 years after the termination of his previous term.

(c) The President shall designate one of the original members of the Foundation to act as chairman of the Foundation until such time as the executive committee referred to in section 5 (a) is elected and chooses its chairman as provided for by section 5 (b). The member so designated shall call the first meeting of the members of the Foundation and shall preside over such meeting until a chairman has been chosen.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendments were, in section 5, on page 5, line 5, after the word "shall", to strike out "except as otherwise provided in this act"; in line 25, after the word "Foundation", to strike out "for submission to the President and the Congress" and insert "and to the President and Congress", so as to make the section read:

CREATION AND POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SEC. 5. (a) The Foundation shall elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of nine members which shall exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation. The executive committee may delegate or assign to officers, employees, and divisions, within the Foundation, any of its powers, duties, and functions.

(b) The executive committee shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman biennially, who shall also serve as chairman and vice chairman of the Foundation. The vice chairman shall perform the duties of the chairman in his absence.

(c) The executive committee shall meet at the call of the chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

(d) Five members of the executive committee shall constitute a quorum.

(e) The executive committee may establish such advisory committees as it may determine to be necessary or desirable for the consideration of programs administered by the Foundation.

(f) The executive committee shall render an annual report to the Foundation, and to the President and Congress summarizing the activities of the Foundation and making such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendments were in section 8, on page 8, line 3, after the words "multiple of", to strike out "four" and insert "twelve"; in line 4, after the words "not less than", to strike out "eight" and insert "twelve"; at the end of the same line to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty-six"; in line 7, after the words "representatives of the", to strike out "War and Navy Departments" and insert "armed services"; in line 8, after the word "numbers", to insert "respectively"; in line 9, after the words "by the", to strike out "Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively" and insert "Secretaries of the principal branches thereof"; at the beginning of line 13 to strike out "five" and insert "not more than six"; in line 16, after the word "thereof", to strike out "one" and insert "a"; in line 16, after the word "representing", to strike out "the War Department and designated by the Secretary of War, and one member of such committee representing the Navy Department and designated by the Secretary of the Navy", and insert "each of the principal branches of the armed services and designated by the Secretary thereof"; on page 9, line 5, after the word "procedure", to insert "subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the Executive Committee"; on page 9, after line 12, to strike out:

(f) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall establish regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property in connection with scientific research (having military significance) under this Act, and for the proper safeguarding of any information or property so classified.

And insert:

(f) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall advise the Director with respect to the establishment of regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property in connection with scientific research (having military significance) under this Act, and for the proper safeguarding of any such information or property which may be classified by the Director in accordance with such regulations and procedures.

So as to make the section read:

DIVISIONAL COMMITTEES

SEC. 8. (a) There shall be a committee for each division of the Foundation.

(b) Each divisional committee, except the Committee for the Division of National Defense, shall be appointed by the Foundation

and shall consist of not less than five persons who may be members or nonmembers of the Foundation.

(c) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall consist of members in a number which is a multiple of twelve, to be fixed by the Foundation, but which shall be not less than twelve and not more than thirty-six. One-half of the members of such committee shall be civilians appointed by the Foundation, and the remaining half shall be representatives of the armed services, designated in equal numbers, respectively, by the Secretaries of the principal branches thereof. There shall be within the divisional committee for the Division of National Defense an executive committee of not more than six, consisting of the chairman of the divisional committee, as chairman; two civilian members of such committee elected annually by the civilian members thereof; a member of such committee representing each of the principal branches of the armed services and designated by the Secretary thereof. Such executive committee shall perform such functions as may be prescribed by the Committee for the Division of National Defense with the approval of the Foundation.

(d) The term of each member of each divisional committee shall be fixed by the appointing or designating authority. Each divisional committee shall annually elect its own chairman from among its own members, and shall prescribe its own rules of procedure, subject to such restrictions as may be prescribed by the executive committee.

(e) Each divisional committee shall have the power and duty to make recommendations to, and advise and consult with, the executive committee and the Director with respect to matters relating to the program of its division, and shall have such additional powers and duties as the Foundation may delegate or assign to it.

(f) The Committee for the Division of National Defense shall advise the Director with respect to the establishment of regulations and procedures for the security classification of information or property in connection with scientific research (having military significance) under this act, and for the proper safeguarding of any such information or property which may be classified by the Director in accordance with such regulations and procedures.

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11, on page 13, after line 17, to strike out:

(b) All inventions produced by employees of the Foundation in the course of their assigned activities for the Foundation shall be made freely available to the public, or, if patented, shall be freely dedicated to the public.

And insert:

(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however*, That this section 11 (b) shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Foundation may establish.

So as to make the section read:

PATENT RIGHTS

SEC. 11. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition

of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed.

(b) No officer or employee of the Foundation shall acquire, retain, or transfer any rights, under the patent laws of the United States or otherwise, in any invention which he may make or produce in connection with performing his assigned activities and which is directly related to the subject matter thereof: *Provided, however*, That this section 11 (b) shall not be construed to prevent any officer or employee of the Foundation from executing any application for patent on any such invention for the purpose of assigning the same to the Government or its nominee in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Foundation may establish.

The next amendment was, in section 15, on page 16, after line 18, to strike out:

(b) The Director may appoint with the approval of the executive committee a Deputy Director who shall receive compensation at a rate of not to exceed \$12,000 per annum.

And insert:

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the executive committee, a Deputy Director who shall exercise and perform the powers and duties of the Director during his absence or disability and shall exercise and perform such powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Director. The Deputy Director shall receive compensation at a rate of not to exceed \$12,000 per annum.

On page 18, line 23, after the word "by", to strike out "the"; in the same line, after the word "organizations", to insert "agencies, and institutions"; on page 19, line 1, after the word "agencies", to strike out "best"; in line 2, after the word "desired", to strike out "and"; in line 5, after the name "District of Columbia", to insert "(3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance further research, and (4) encourage the growth of independent research by individuals."; and on page 19, after line 14, to insert:

(j) Funds available to any agency of the Government for scientific or technical research or development, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the agency involved, in whole or in part to the Foundation, and funds so transferred shall be expendable in the same manner and for the same purposes as funds appropriated to the Foundation for its general purposes.

(k) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Foundation, together with such of the personnel, records, property, and balances of appropriations as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the President. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the President shall direct.

So as to make the section read:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 15. (a) The Director shall appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that, when deemed desirable by the Director, technical and professional personnel may be employed without regard to the civil-service laws

or regulations, and their compensation may be fixed without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Deputy Director hereinafter provided for, and the members of the divisional committees and advisory committees, shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or regulations.

(b) The Director may appoint, with the approval of the executive committee, a Deputy Director who shall exercise and perform the powers and duties of the Director during his absence or disability and shall exercise and perform such powers and duties as may be delegated to him by the Director. The Deputy Director shall receive compensation at a rate of not to exceed \$12,000 per annum.

(c) The Foundation shall not, itself, operate any laboratories or pilot plants.

(d) The members of the Foundation, and the members of each divisional committee and of each advisory committee appointed by the Foundation, shall receive compensation at the rate of \$50 for each day engaged in the business of the Foundation, and shall be allowed actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses (including, in lieu of subsistence, per diem allowances at a rate not in excess of \$10) when engaged, away from home, in the duties of their offices.

(e) Persons holding other offices in the executive branch of the Federal Government may serve as members of the divisional committees or of any advisory committee appointed by the Foundation, but they shall not receive remuneration for their services as such members during any period for which they receive compensation for their services in such other offices.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Foundation or of a divisional committee or of an advisory committee shall not be considered as service bringing him within the provisions of section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 18, secs. 198 and 203) or section 19 (e) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, unless the act of such individual, which by such section is made unlawful when performed by an individual referred to in such section, is with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the Foundation or in which the Foundation is directly interested.

(g) The Office of Scientific Research and Development is abolished, and its affairs shall be liquidated by the Foundation, which shall be its successor agency. The property, records, funds (including all unexpended balances of appropriations or other funds now available), and contracts (and rights and obligations thereunder) of the Office of Scientific Research and Development are transferred to the Foundation. Such abolition and transfer shall take effect as of the date upon which five members of the executive committee provided for in section 5 have qualified and taken office.

(h) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will, in its discretion, best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals, including Government agencies, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired; (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States and Territories and the District of Columbia; (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which, if aided, will advance further research; and (4) encourage the growth of independent research by individuals.

(i) The activities of the Foundation shall be construed as supplementing and not superseding, curtailing, or limiting any of the functions or activities of other Government agencies (except the Office of Scientific Research and Development) authorized to en-

gage in scientific research or scientific development.

(j) Funds available to any agency of the Government for scientific or technical research or development, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, with the approval of the head of the agency involved, in whole or in part to the Foundation, and funds so transferred shall be expendable in the same manner and for the same purposes as funds appropriated to the Foundation for its general purposes.

(k) The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel shall be transferred from the Department of Labor to the Foundation, together with such of the personnel, records, property, and balances of appropriations as have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of such roster as may be determined by the President. The transfer provided for in this subsection shall take effect at such time or times as the President shall direct.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KILGORE obtained the floor.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may propound a question to the Senator from New Jersey in connection with a matter which he has discussed?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. O'CONOR. May I ask the Senator whether, in his opinion, there are adequate safeguards in the bill for the protection of the rights of individuals in the administration of patents, for example, or whether such rights might be claimed by an institution or subdivision?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator to page 13, section 11, subsection (a), which provides for patents and the protection of individuals, as we conceived it to be covered by this type of bill. I quote from section 11:

SEC. 11. (a) Each contract or other arrangement executed by the Foundation which relates to scientific research shall contain provisions governing the disposition of inventions produced thereunder in a manner calculated to protect the public interest and the equities of the individual or organization with which the contract or other arrangement is executed.

It was felt by the committee that especially in view of the fact that we are dealing with basic science rather than applied science, there would be very few cases in which the patent issue would arise, but that when it did arise it would be protected by the contract made by the Foundation with the institution or individual concerned.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for the information and express myself as satisfied that this is a proposal which can be of inestimable value to our generation.

Will the Senator state whether or not in his opinion there is any proper method established for the screening of applications so that there might be eliminated proposals from irresponsible sources, or what in the vernacular might be termed "crackpot" suggestions?

Mr. SMITH. I will say to the distinguished Senator that we made no legislative detailed rules, because we felt that

the way in which the Foundation would be established, with 24 selected persons appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, was the wiser way to protect us in the screening process in determining what basic areas of research should be pursued by the Foundation. We felt that that was the best protection that could be given to the American people in the proper handling of the Foundation.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I notice one provision on page 11 which I think should be explained. I refer to the language in line 3, in which we say:

No individual shall be listed in such register without his consent.

I ask the Senator from New Jersey whether that means that the Foundation will maintain a register of scientific and technical personnel of all types, including those who have fellowships and scholarships.

Mr. SMITH. That is my understanding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Therefore the restriction that no individual shall be listed in such register without his consent means that no scientifically inclined person need participate unless he wishes to do so.

Mr. SMITH. I think that is the correct explanation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Undoubtedly most of those who receive scholarships or fellowships would be listed anyway, with or without their consent.

Mr. SMITH. I think they would be listed automatically. Probably they would want to be listed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to state at the outset that I agree with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] that this is an important piece of legislation. It is not only important, but it is one of the most important that will face this Congress. It seems a crying shame to me that yesterday afternoon, and again this afternoon, when a matter of the importance of this legislation is under consideration, affecting not only the safety of this country, but its health and welfare and prosperity, there should be present not more than a handful of Members of the Senate, who will vote on a bill about which they apparently know nothing unless they have studied it.

Mr. President, in my opinion the bill contains a few major weaknesses. The purpose of the bill is one which we can no longer avoid, one upon which we as a Congress must take action. The general purpose is the development in this country of a body of research scientists. Many persons look upon this bill as a step in the development of scientific research. What is scientific research? Scientific research has one foundation—stone, and that is the building of a body of persons capable of carrying it on, and the maintenance of that body of workers so that when the occasion arises the necessary research will be done.

Let us look at the problem from the military viewpoint. A new weapon may be developed tomorrow, the next day, or next month. We found that weapons developed 20 years ago were obsolete when we got into World War II. We discovered that the same thing was true even of weapons developed a year before. Anyone who doubts that statement should read the history of the famous Grant tank at El Alamein. Thus it should be clear that it is the personnel capable of going ahead with these projects that means so much to this country.

We have had a rather backward view of research. It has been purely commercial, dollar-conscious, nickel-conscious, penny-conscious. We led the world in applied research and applied engineering; but we have taken from others—from Germany, from England, from France, and from Italy—the basic ideals. We talk about the atomic bomb. The principle of atomic fission was discovered long ago. We made a spectacular application of it. The people of the United States think that we have the secret of the atomic bomb, but actually its basic principles were discovered in Europe originally, and other principles far in advance of those may be discovered any day abroad and the application which we have made may become obsolete. This is best illustrated by the fact that one of the principal questions in connection with this bill is that of dollar application. The theory of the bill, as it now rests, is that it is a bill for scientists. I do not say, to produce scientists; I say, for scientists. It is a bill for patents. What are patents? Patents are property; they are property rights in the things that are developed. But the minute the United States Government undertakes to apply to inventions the same principles that are applied by every commercial company in the United States, hands are thrown up in holy horror, and it is said that the people, as stockholders in the corporation, should not apply those principles, that, if they do, they cannot get to work for them such scientists as those who work for companies X, Y, and Z.

Let me refer to the history of this subject. There has been some talk about it. I have been engaged in an investigation of this subject since 1941. I have drafted, with the assistance of others, 11 or 12 bills seeking to bring this matter to a head. In the Seventy-ninth Congress we drafted a bill. After it was drafted we met in the old Military Affairs Committee room, across the hall from this chamber, with Dr. Bush, whose name has frequently been mentioned, Dr. Bowman, and various others. We prepared a bill which would produce the result upon which we agreed, and we agreed that the bill would work. The bill was brought to the Senate floor with the understanding that it was a compromise measure; it was a measure to which even the most inveterate opponents of monopoly could not object. It was only when Mr. Teeter, who sat opposite the Senator from New Jersey during the hearings, became active when the bill reached the floor of the House, that it was discovered that some people who

were in the meeting had welshed on their agreement.

The principle of this bill is of paramount importance, but the principle is not as yet adequately represented. The principle of the bill, I may say, Mr. President, is, first, the development in the United States of a group of research scientists. Let me define what I mean by that. It has been well defined by Dr. Bush, Dr. Jewett, Dr. Bowman, Dr. Conant, and various others, who stated in the hearings in the Committee on Military Affairs, which hearings apparently have not as yet been read, that no invention or discovery of real value in the basic sciences was ever made by persons over 35 years of age. The basic principles come from young scientists; the theory being, apparently, that when they are over 35 they become, so to speak, in a rut. Thus it means that if we in the United States hope to go ahead and maintain our place in the sun, we must have a constant flow of young scientists. We have woefully slipped in that endeavor. We drafted our young scientists during the war; we made infantrymen of them. We did everything with them except what should have been done.

Today we find ourselves at a blossoming period in the United States, devoid of most of our scientific students except those who were rated under a IV-F classification, those who are taking advantage of the GI bill of rights, and some who are endeavoring with their own private funds to get an education. We have lost at least 5 years, and we were woefully behind even before we lost those years. We were not keeping abreast of research. That is plainly evidenced by the fact that the country could afford to go into applied research only in the case of engineering work. Let me give the Senate an example. Penicillin was discovered in England long years before it was ever used in this country. We conducted applied research which produced a commercial method of manufacture. But all research has been dominated by one thing—commercialism, the dollar value. That is one thing we should get away from if we can, if we expect to progress. We have bought basic ideas from Germany, and in the buying of them we have surrendered our rights by entering into cartels. We have bought them from England, France, and Italy, and then we have gone ahead with engineering and merely applied them. They will return great benefits to us if we properly apply them, if we give to the young men and women of inquisitive and scientific minds a chance to get an education, if we encourage them to forge ahead and to advance into the unexplored fields of science, the great unknown. Dr. Bush called it the great frontier. No frontier can be adequately maintained unless we have a sufficient number of people to explore it, guard it, protect it, and to advance along the frontier when opportunity demands. Science is the great frontier, but unfortunately we have gone ahead only in those fields which paid dollar dividends. We have spent millions of dollars in discovering a new enamel for refrigerators that will not stain. I think it was the General Motors Corp. which devoted 12

months' time in research because an atmospheric condition in Baltimore caused the enamel on a refrigerator to stain. At the same time no effort was made to do certain other things which might have been done. I do not blame GMC. They are in business for money, and they must take care of themselves. We in the Government are interested in the welfare of all the people, and for that reason we must develop scientists and take care of them.

As I have stated, at the last session of the Congress the Senate passed a bill known as Senate bill 1850 which had been agreed upon as a workable bill, a bill under which we could do the greatest amount of development with the least amount of interference with private enterprise. That bill passed the Senate after a 4-day debate in which every point was discussed. It went to the House, where, due to various conditions, it died by a process of strangulation, I may say.

In the main I agree with the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], for himself and other Senators, except as to certain operational necessities. I want to suggest one idea with regard to the bill. I do not want this bill to be a basis for loot and theft. I am going to be frank, Mr. President, and call a spade a spade. We must realize that the people of the United States—not merely a small group, but the whole people of our country—are going to support these efforts and have an interest in the results, if any are achieved. I agree with the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that the major portion of the processes and articles derived from this research, indeed, I should say 80 percent of it, will not in any sense of the word be patentable; but a certain percentage, particularly as pertains to the national defense, will be patentable.

In the past we have patented new inventions in connection with national defense, and have turned over the manufacturing rights in connection with them to certain private companies, that, in many cases, under cartel agreements, as is plainly shown by records in the possession of the United States Senate, have made such inventions available to foreign nations, and have received payment therefor, so that in those cases the results of Government research went for naught.

In the past our Government has developed other things for which private organizations have sought to take credit. For instance, let me refer to the processes for the hardening of woods. In this instance there was a great deal of newspaper publicity, in which credit was given to a certain private company as being responsible for the development of those processes, although they were actually developed by the Government. Finally the company which received the publicity apologized and said it was merely manufacturing under the processes perfected by Government scientists.

Mr. President, in this bill we should seek to avoid various mistakes which have been made in other cases. Nevertheless, in the first place, it was admitted by the Senator from New Jersey that under the bill the plan is to proceed by the trial-and-error method. It is use-

less to follow a trial-and-error method when we know that something is wrong. We had better cure it in advance; that is only common horse sense.

Mr. President, why do Senators think they were sent to Washington? Do our States send us to Washington as Members of the Senate and do they send Members of the House of Representatives to Washington, and merely give us a license to muddle through, to experiment with the people's money by means of trial-and-error methods? Or do the people send us to Washington to use the sense God gave us and the sense they think we possess; they may be making a terrific mistake about that, and sometimes I think they are, so that there may be a minimum of error and a maximum avoidance of the trial process; in short, so that we, the representatives of the people of the United States, may proceed to enact laws which will be so well considered in advance that in most cases a process of trial-and-error will not be necessary. I do not like the trial-and-error method, and I do not think the people like it. It is the little fellow who always suffers under the trial-and-error procedure; he is the one who is hurt, and who does not have sufficient money to hire the lawyers to protect himself.

As I have said, I have long been interested in scientific research and a Government scientific foundation. I have been working on it for a long time, even at times when it was almost dangerous to do so; at times when, if a man went into the McGraw-Hill organization or into other organizations of a similar nature and admitted that he was interested in a Government scientific research program, he would almost have been shot.

Mr. President, as we were told yesterday, the committee heard 150 scientists testify in regard to this subject. Let me say something which was not stated yesterday, namely, that the only one of the 150 scientists who testified in opposition to the bill was a very distinguished scientist by the name of Dr. Jewett, who is president of the Bell Research Laboratories, vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and at the time he testified was president of the National Academy of Sciences. All the other scientists who testified were in favor of the entire program proposed by the bill. For some reason, unknown to me, Dr. Jewett opposed it. However, he is, and has for a long time been, the leading figure in the National Academy of Sciences. I call attention to the section of the bill which provides that the National Academy of Sciences shall nominate—and probably dominate—the dollar-a-year board which would have control of the operations under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, recently, at a meeting in Washington of outstanding scientists representing the leading scientific societies of the United States, those at the meeting went on record by casting a number of votes in regard to the various provisions of this bill. I should like to state for the RECORD something with regard to those votes. According to the minutes of the meeting, which was held on February 23 of this year, a straw vote was cast, for instance, on the question of

the administrative set-up to be established. In that vote, 41 of an approximate total of 115 who were present voted in favor of having a single administrator. Only 22 voted in favor of a part-time board, which is suggested by the pending bill. Thirty-two were in favor of a full-time board, and 18 expressed no preference. That vote was on the question of the form of administration to be established. In my opinion, the provisions of the pending bill with respect to that matter constitute one of the weaknesses of the bill. As I have said, all those scientists testified that unless our Government took action to further scientific research, basic science in the United States would not advance beyond its present state, and in fact would deteriorate, because of the failure to train thousands of potential scientists.

Mr. President, during the past 5 years I have received a tremendous volume of correspondence on this subject. It has covered many details. I wish to direct the especial attention of the Members of the Senate to three principal items for which provision is made in the pending measure, because they are the principal points which have been raised in these discussions. Although I feel the utmost sympathy for the attitude of many of the writers, I also realize that if a Government proposal affecting the bar association were presented to a group of lawyers, they would tend to be highly critical and to take a stand in opposition; and it seems to me that we would meet with a similar situation in the case of a group of doctors or in the case of a group of farmers. We must remember that most of our scientists have spent their lives in universities or in private commercial laboratories. They have worked with or under research foundations administered by boards of trustees or directors, practically all of whom are hired for their business ability. In most instances, the men on those boards of trustees or boards of directors are appointed or elected to serve as trustees or directors of certain funds which private philanthropy has provided, or, in the case of Government, funds which have been dedicated to one direct objective, as was the case when the Congress recently appropriated \$200,000,000 for research for the Army alone. I may mention also the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, and others, in which research is carried on under certain specific directives. In order to utilize the funds, the board of trustees establishes an operating agency of scientists, usually at a university or in connection with a foundation, and then selects and hires an administrative head or officer to handle the business and administrative details. He, in turn, selects and hires the technical operating staff. That is the way these things are handled, and have been handled in the past.

In the business end, the men who handle the funds are specially trained for that purpose, and they select the technical men who say how the funds shall be spent, and what are the most worthwhile projects.

Mr. President, we are stepping into an unexplored field. Never before has this

Nation thought of going into a project of research, which would seek unexplored fields and explore them, and in that operation pick out to be explored first the most important ones which would bring the greatest benefit in the shortest time. Never have we sought to develop the scientists to explore those fields. We have appropriated money to train soldiers, we have appropriated money to train various others; but never have we appropriated men to handle the most important part of the defense of this country, not only in peacetime, but in wartime.

Much was said yesterday about the various scientific organizations which have done magnificent work for the Nation, and I do not wish in any way to decry those organizations. In 1863, when the War Between the States was in progress, when the Union Army needed the utmost which could be provided by scientific development, which then was relatively small, President Lincoln first organized a group of scientists, and later a bill was passed creating the National Academy of Sciences. It functioned magnificently during the Civil War.

The Spanish-American War was relatively a minor skirmish, and not much along this line was needed. We were then experimenting with dynamite-throwing ships, but that was done by the Navy.

World War I came along, and a new organization was set up. Why did the Government set up a new organization? Why did it not continue the old organization, the National Academy of Sciences? It was because the National Academy of Sciences, born in the heart of a bitter war, which had done magnificent work in that war, had gradually become a society to honor leading scientists by electing them to membership. We had to get a new organization for World War I. We got one, and it did fine work in that war. But once the patriotic fervor and the patriotic demand of war ceased, just as in the case of the National Academy of Sciences, it retrograded to a peacetime status.

Then came World War II. We had the National Academy of Sciences, we had the organization which followed it. Nevertheless we had to create the Office of Scientific Research and Development, because the second organization had in turn become obsolete and obsolescent. In both cases no provision had been made to maintain an operating scientific agency, to pay people to see that progress was made. Once the fervor and the patriotism of war had passed, there was not much activity.

Oh, yes, we can submit a question to the National Academy of Sciences, and eventually, when they have had time to look into it, a group will be appointed to go into the matter, and then eventually, when the group has had time to operate, their suggestions will be submitted.

Mr. President, I do not blame them. Those gentlemen are busy. All of them are men of great scientific attainment. They are men who have to make a living. They have families to support. They have to keep progressing in the businesses in which they are engaged.

A college president cannot leave his college every two weeks and journey to Washington, to spend several days looking over the minute details of operating a government agency. He may meet with others, and gladly will meet, for the formulation of general policy, but the details have to be neglected. He cannot find the time to meet others and lay down policies which will last for several months, unless they be very general.

Mr. President, let us go back to the year 1942, and read some of the reports of the War Investigating Committee and a few of the reports of other committees on the subject of dollar-a-year men, and the waste entailed by the utilization of dollar-a-year men, the waste entailed in war by the fact that we could not hire competent men, the men we needed, and put them on a full-time basis. I suggest that Members of the Senate go to the General Electric Co. and talk to Mr. C. E. Wilson, who gave up his position as president of that company, and came to Washington and worked for \$9,500 a year, because he declined to be a dollar-a-year man. I have the utmost respect and love for Mr. Wilson; he is a splendid, patriotic American.

Talk to Donald Nelson, who was the head of the War Production Board. He did the same thing. Talk to a few others who declined to be part-time men, and, instead, accepted a bare living wage in order to devote their entire time to the Government service in Washington, and be cut off from other things. If Senators will talk to these men, they will understand to what I am referring when I speak of administrative questions.

So, Mr. President, the question of administration is important, because the previous, "part-time" administrations have failed, except in time of war. In time of war men will give their time to their government, and gladly give it, but in time of peace it is different. It is hard to get men who will devote the time necessary to enable them to go into the most minute details of operating an organization of the size and of the national importance of the proposed Foundation.

Russia has set up a program by which in 5 years she hopes to overshadow the rest of the world in the development of scientists, under a foundation which makes provision for sending potential scientists to school. If we would keep our place in the sun, we cannot depend on the basic research of Germany as we have in the past, we cannot afford to have our business and our defense efforts stultified by being compelled to buy their second-hand manufacturing licenses under their patents. We have to find new methods, new things, new men, and we have to develop the men who can function efficiently in this Nation.

As I said before, the scientists in colleges and universities have their work cut out for them. They are 7-day-a-week men. The scientists in the large laboratories, except the executive types, have their work cut out for them, and one of their first tasks is to see that their laboratories do not get into a jam by losing any patent rights.

We are looking after the Government. I care not how many men come from various corporations and ask me to protect the patent rights of corporations. I shall make the same answer I have always made, "I want to do the same thing for my Government, which is the greatest corporation in the United States of America, that you gentlemen do for the private corporations you represent." That touches on one feature which I think is a weakness in the bill.

Note that under the pending bill, if the Senate follows the recommendation of the committee, the Foundation is to be composed of 24 men selected by the President, from lists submitted by the National Academy of Sciences, the Association of Land Grant Colleges, and the Association of State Universities, and such other scientific or educational societies as the President may wish to consult. I should like to ask that, at some time during the debate, my very distinguished friend, the Senator from New Jersey, place in the RECORD a list of all the scientific societies in the United States that could qualify under the pending bill. It would be interesting to see to what extent they interlock, and to see how many jealousies there would be.

Under the bill the Foundation in effect selects a director on a full-time basis. However, the director is answerable only to a select executive group of 9, who in turn are answerable only to a general group of 24, who in turn are answerable to nobody. I have observed similar groups in operation over a long period of time, and I have discovered that multiple groups may be extremely valuable on judicial questions, in advisory capacities, and in laying down general policies; but, when it comes to the employment of a man who is answerable only to such group, I find the multiple group does not function so well. Numerous experiences of governments, both State and National, in the past 25 years have shown the weakness of multiple groups. The same thing is true in respect to the employment of a part-time man, who may say, "I simply did not have time; I was simply too busy in the laboratory to investigate this matter thoroughly; I have to rely on the suggestions of John Smith, here."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wonder whether the Senator, out of his long experience, is able to cite any precedent for an organization of this particular type, connected with the Government?

Mr. KILGORE. No; I can think of no precedent in the Federal Government for this particular type of organization. There are, however, many general precedents, involving boards that have been established. I may mention as a fair precedent, the dual control of OPM, two men having been appointed to head the Office of Production Management. As a result, nobody ran it. Before that, there was a committee of five. If it had been left in the hands either of the two men or of the committee of five, with no responsibility on the part of a single individual, I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that I do not know whether by this time we should have been saluting

the Rising Sun of Japan or the Cross of Hitler. In any event, we certainly would not have had any of the equipment which was so badly needed in the war. Every time poor old General Knudsen was jumped on he had the convenient excuse of blaming it on his associate, who had blocked him; and every time General Knudsen's associate was jumped on he had the convenient excuse of blaming it on General Knudsen. When it was handled by a committee of five, each one of the five was able to pass the blame on to four others. There was no responsibility to the Government on the part of any single individual.

Mr. President, let us not get away from the fact that, if we are to believe the Constitution, the Government of the United States consists of every citizen of the United States. We speak of the Government in Washington, or the Government in some other place. The people of the United States are the Government, and, when the people are paying the money and furnishing everything, certainly they must be entitled to an accounting by their elected representatives; they should not be left to a hand-picked group having no particular responsibility to the people.

I do not want the debate to be influenced by politics. What I am saying is that I do not want our action to be dominated by partisan politics. I realize that under present conditions that is to be avoided. I think that a President, answerable to the whole people, would and should be above that.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. I merely wanted to ask the Senator one question. I gathered from his statement that he considered the functions of OPM to have been cast in exactly the same mold as that provided in the scientific research bill. I entirely disagree with him. There is at this time a project of an entirely different kind to be carried out. What failed in the case of the OPM has nothing whatever to do with the present debate, and is entirely apart from the discussion.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey whether he can define the duties of the OPM and its predecessor, the National Council?

Mr. SMITH. All I can say is, I see no possible relation between OPM and the National Science Foundation. The point I make is that the argument is not relevant.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator from New Jersey know what the duties of the OPM were?

Mr. SMITH. No; I do not.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say that the duties of OPM were very similar to the duties of the National Science Foundation, proposed in the pending bill.

Mr. SMITH. I simply disagree with that.

Mr. KILGORE. The duties of OPM were, without contract, controls, or anything else, to obtain production, which is what the National Science Foundation is going to be required to do. The Foundation, without the ability to enter into ironclad contracts, or to draft people,

and things of that kind, must produce scientists. It will have to do just as the OPM did. However, that is not the vital point. The vital point is that where there is a division of responsibility to such an extent that responsibility can be shifted from person to person there is never an acceptance of responsibility by anyone.

I refer to the pending bill:

The Foundation shall elect biennially from its own membership an executive committee composed of nine members, which shall exercise the powers and duties of the Foundation.

Under that provision, the members of the executive committee become the agents of the United States Government.

The executive committee may delegate or assign to officers, employees, and divisions within the Foundation any of its powers, duties, and functions.

It may, therefore, shift its responsibilities, if it so desires. It is a great buck-passing proposition.

The executive committee shall choose its own chairman and vice chairman biennially, who shall also serve as chairman and vice chairman of the Foundation. The vice chairman shall perform the duties of the chairman in his absence.

The executive committee shall meet at the call of the chairman or at such times as may be fixed by itself, but not less than six times each year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I was interrupted a moment ago. What I had in mind was, in the field of applied science, an activity such as that of the Bureau of Standards, the general purpose of which, in a sense, is similar to what is being attempted by the pending bill. In agriculture a good deal of basic research has been performed; but as an administrative matter independent agencies have not been set up—Independent, we will say, on the one hand, of the Secretary of Commerce, or, on the other hand, of the Secretary of Agriculture. The matter of the administrator's responsibility seems to me to be very important. It is the same as the problem with which the Senate struggled last year, at which time something in the nature of a compromise was reached, still retaining responsibility to the Government. That is the point I think should be made very clear.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. That is a correct statement of what was done last year. A method of selecting the administrator was determined, as a result of which he was made responsible. That was done with the view of obtaining his best services, while at the same time permitting scientific groups, through the suggestion of names, to have the utmost say in his selection. Responsibility was also placed upon the President of the United States, in order that he might not, as it were, shirk the responsibility of naming a well-qualified man.

Before I yield further to the Senator from Arkansas may I say that, in my opinion, the best illustration of that

situation is the Bureau suggested by the Senator, namely, the Bureau of Standards. Perhaps the Senator from Arkansas does not remember, but about 14 months ago I think every Senator and every Member of the House and many others were asked by the Secretary of Commerce if we could recommend an individual to head the Bureau of Standards. The reason was that the Director of the Bureau of Standards was about to retire and the Secretary wanted as his successor the best man among the top-flight scientists in the United States. He asked us if we could recommend such a man. I am sure the Senator from Arkansas received the same kind of letter I did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. At that time I did not make a recommendation, but I was very much impressed by the way in which the Secretary approached the situation. He said, "I want the best man I can place in that position, a man who is both a scientist and an administrator." I believe he secured a good man for the position.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I also believe he did. Will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have some sympathy with the argument that there should be no politics connected with the Foundation. We hear such statements on all sides. We hear such statements in respect to State educational institutions. I have had some experience along that line. I do not believe the answer is to try to cut out the influence of politics in connection with responsibility for a public institution. The only answer is to have good politics.

The Senator said something about nonpartisan politics, or whatever words he used. The word "politics" has through the years come to mean different things to different people, but basically I do not think the answer is to try to cut off politics. I do not think that is sound procedure, as the Senator has pointed out. So long as Government money goes to support an institution, and it is directed toward the public benefit, I myself do not see that it is necessary to divorce it from politics. There must be some trained responsibility at the head. We cannot legislate soundly if we do not secure good administrators. It is essential that good men be found to administer organizations which are directed toward the public interest. That is illustrated by what has happened in connection with the information service in the State Department. Everyone agrees that the information service in the State Department is a good thing, but some do not like the way it is administered, therefore they wish to abolish it.

Mr. KILGORE. Knowing that the Senator from Arkansas was once the head of an educational institution, I wish to cite to him a situation which might well be considered in connection with what we are now asked to do. Let us say that a man selected to administer an institution is not answerable to public authority, but is answerable to a nine-man executive committee. Let us say that, nevertheless, a legislative

body may control him by threatening to cut or actually cutting off his appropriation. How would a university or any State educational institution be able to operate if the legislature, the Governor, or anyone else connected with the State government said to the administrator: "If you do not do just what we want you to do in connection with the institution of which you are the head, we are going to cut off the money needed for its operation"?

Mr. President, I have found that the average educational institution appreciates constructive views from Governors and State officials. When they make mistakes they want to have them called to their attention and they endeavor to correct them. They do not want to have the State funds cut off. The members of the board of governors of any educational institution who are appointed are usually laymen who are placed on the board to give advice, to find out how things are working, and see to it that certain things do not happen. A board of governors consisting only of college professors would not work well.

Senators may remember that the bill passed by the Senate last year contained a subdivision similar to the one contained in the pending amendment. It provided for a director, and for a board to serve under him consisting of men representing a cross section of the finest minds that could be found, and below the board we provided what might be called the college professors or deans. The bill provided for committees and divisions to plan all the scientific work. Then it provided for another individual who knew all the cross sections, who could come forward and say, "We think the work you are doing is fine. We will get the money needed, and stand back of you." Then the men who really controlled the policy down below, who did the work, felt safe in going ahead.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his remarks and his suggestion. I think he is absolutely correct. Bad politics always interferes with successful operation of an institution. But I may say that, as the Senator well knows, our Government is run by politics. Politics is policy making. If politics were abolished, democracy would cease. We could not even have a republic without politics. Perhaps my good friends across the aisle might insist that we could. But I would say that we could not even have a Republican Party without politics. The Government is operated by politics. The better the politics the better the Government and the better off are the people. If politics should be abolished, what would we have? We would have totalitarianism or an oligarchy, because that is what comes from abolition of politics. Politics is necessary to the successful operation of a free government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sorry I was obliged to leave the Senate Chamber while the Senator from West Virginia was delivering his fine address, but so long as he is on the subject of the administration of the Foundation, I wish

to say that yesterday, on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas and myself, I submitted a sort of compromise choice between what is represented by the idea advanced by the Senator from West Virginia, as embodied in last year's bill, and the idea embodied in my original bill, and somewhat different from what is contained in the pending bill. After some conferences that proposal was found to be subject to amendment, and I have now prepared language which I desire to send to the desk and ask to have lie on the table. The amendment I propose reads as follows:

SEC. 6. Director of the Foundation: There shall be a Director of Foundation who, subject to the supervision and control of the Executive Committee, shall execute the policies of the Foundation and perform such additional duties as may be prescribed by the Foundation. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, after receiving the recommendations of the Executive Committee, and he shall serve for a term of 4 years subject to removal by the President or the Foundation. The Director shall receive compensation at the rate of \$15,000 per year.

The only difference between the substitute proposal and the original proposal is that the original proposal provides that the Director shall serve at the pleasure of the President, and our proposal limits his term to 4 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I favor a full-time administrator. Under the present implementation of the bill provision is made for a full-time administrator who is responsible only to a committee of 9, and through them to a committee of 24. He serves, it is true, by appointment of the President and at the will and pleasure of the President, but he has to report only to the President, only once a year, and then the only thing the President can do, if he wants to do anything, is dismiss him. The only thing the Congress can do, if it wants to do anything, is to cut off the appropriation. There is no chance to place a check upon him because he is the servant of a small selected group, not the employee of the Government of the United States. We are subsidizing that group.

There is another thing appearing further along in the implementation which I do not like. I now am thinking of the plane on which the real scientific work must be done. Again going back to Dr. Bush's Science—The Endless Frontier, I wonder if we could defend a frontier, Mr. President, if the soldiers charged with its defense served whenever they felt like it and without pay. I well remember reading a book dealing with the Boer War, which I always said contained the perfect illustration of how not to win a war. The book described soldiers who served in just that way. If the soldiers wanted to go visiting, they went visiting. The number one sentry, when he went on outpost duty, always took two servants and a feather bed with him. He and his servants rode out on their horses, and when they got to the outpost the servants immediately prepared the feather bed, and the soldier went to sleep on it, and

the two servants stood one at the head of the bed and the other at the foot of the bed, and if some one tried to come through the guard line the soldier was awakened, and since he possessed the only gun, he was the only one who could challenge. But if someone came up to the guard line and fired before the soldier was awakened, that was the end of that soldier. If we are going to defend the endless frontier and keep scientific exploration constantly proceeding, we cannot depend on part-time individuals in toto.

The bill which the Senate passed last year provided for a full-time deputy to coordinate the work of the committee, and to see that its members were called together and that they were operating in their own particular fields.

I think that is absolutely essential. It is not contained in the present bill. I do not see how any group can hope to function, can hope to carry on this exploration, can hope to maintain this frontier, can hope to eliminate useless projects and promote useful projects, if we have a committee which comes to Washington occasionally at the call of the chairman, a committee none of whose members are paid except, as was stated by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], \$50 a day when they come here. How can we operate in that way and expect to hold the frontier and carry on the exploration?

If I were not convinced that there are many scientists who are willing to accept the challenge of these full-time tasks, I would not support legislation to establish the Foundation. They may be willing to take over these jobs, but we cannot expect them to work for us and try to carry on another full-time job at the same time, and devote the necessary time to the task. If we agree that the National Science Foundation is to be a governmental agency rather than a quasi-public civic organization of some kind, and if we agree that the powers of such an agency must be vested in full-time Government employees with no responsibility other than to science and the Nation, we must still face the problem of the best form of top administration.

There are two general solutions to the problem of top administration. Both are known. Senators have heard both solutions described. We have one more. All the solutions have real advantages, and they all have disadvantages.

The first solution is that of having the President appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, a single administrator in whom all powers of the agency are vested, and in whom all responsibilities are vested. This administrator, in turn, selects and hires other Government employees and his division chiefs. These, in turn, select their subordinates. Thus there is created a definite organization similar to the Department of Agriculture, which has done magnificent work in the research field with a like organization; similar to the Department of Commerce, which operates the Bureau of Standards so adequately; similar to the Department of the Interior, which handles mine safety and mine engineering so well, under Dr. Sayers. The same

system is used in all Government departments and in bureaus of those departments. It has also been successful in many agencies of the executive branch of the Government. This agency must be a part of the executive branch.

The advantages of the single-administrator form of organization are clear-cut. He has all the responsibility for the success or failure of the organization. If it is satisfactory he gets the credit. If it is unsatisfactory he takes the blame. Everyone working in the agency knows the responsibilities under which he works. If one division is not doing a good job, the man in charge of that division takes the blame.

The disadvantages of the single-administrator form are simply stated. It involves placing heavy responsibility in the hands of one man. If he is a good man, if he selects able administrative assistants and accepts their counsel in arriving at decisions, he will operate a good agency. Is not that true all the way through the Government, regardless of what party is in power and regardless of the period of time in which we were operating? That system has not produced a bad country. It has produced a country which you, Mr. President, and I would not wish to leave to become a resident of some other country.

That is the policy under which we have grown up, regardless of whether the President was a Republican or a Democrat. Regardless of the politics of Congress, there has always been on every Member of this body the responsibility to his own people. There has always been responsibility on the part of the chief of every bureau, upon the President, and upon all of us. There has always been one man on whom responsibility could be fixed. We know that if we vote wrong on the floor of the Senate the people of our home States will call it to our attention. They will not blame some other organization for our vote. They will not accept any such explanations. They will say, "Senator So-and-So did not vote in accordance with our interests."

If the President does something wrong, his is the responsibility. If the secretary in charge or the head of any Government agency does something wrong, the people will blame it on him.

But suppose we had five Presidents. Suppose we had a committee of Senators from each State, or a committee of Members of the House of Representatives. Where would the people place the blame? How many persons in the United States know the names of all the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a relatively small body? How many persons in the United States know the names of the members of the CAA or the CAB? But they all know the name of the head of a department, or they can find out in a hurry, and they can jump on him. They know who is President. They know who their Representative is, and who their Senator is. That is the reason for responsibility and credit, and that is what produces good government.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The criticism which is advanced on the ground of politics is one-sided. Is not such criticism offset by the probability that there will develop, under the administration as established, a conflict of interest between the interests of the large board and the interests of the institutions which its members represent, institutions which are likely to be the agencies with which contracts are made?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, we never eliminate the question of the possibility of a conflict of interest—the possibility of political interference on the one hand if the member happens to be appointed and is responsible to the Government; or, on the other hand, a corresponding conflict of interest in the case of a man, we will say, from Massachusetts Institute of Technology who happens to be on the board. There will undoubtedly be contracts between the Foundation and MIT. Does the Senator feel that the member would not be influenced in the consideration of such a contract?

There is the element of interest which we often call politics, which will be in the picture anyway. On the other hand, there is the interest of the organizations with which the scientists who make up the board may be identified, institutions with which contracts will be made for research. So we do not eliminate that problem. We only shift it to a different field, where there is not the responsibility which would exist if the man were appointed by the Government itself.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. He has hit the nail squarely on the head. The responsibility of the single administrator to the Government, to the President, to the Congress, and to the people as a whole, rather than to a selective group of 9 or 24, who in turn are not known to the people, is much safer from the standpoint of the betterment of the program than would be his responsibility to a group of 9 or 24. There would be less chance of what we may call political maneuvering than there would be if the member were responsible only to a small group.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To make it clear, the 24 members, as I understand, will be selected from among the leading scientists of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Nine out of ten will be from the leading institutions of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. Either from the leading institutions of the country or the leading laboratories. They will have to be from one or the other category—from the private laboratory or the public laboratory.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are the institutions with which contracts will be made.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So we are confronted with a very serious problem. Should the men who are to make contracts involving large sums of Government money have control over such contracts when they are identified with the institutions with which the contracts are

made, which institutions really pay them?

We have heard a great deal about the \$1-a-year men who came to Washington during the war from the United States Steel Corp. They are alleged to have favored the United States Steel Corp. in contracts. In this instance we would have the case of a man from MIT, for example, who might favor MIT with a contract. That condition is inherent in any such situation, regardless of the honesty of the men involved.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Those are natural feelings which people have. We do not avoid that question by establishing a board of pure scientists—I mean “pure” in character. That is an illusion. They may be the best kind of men, but they will be subject to the same sort of interests.

Mr. KILGORE. In reply to the Senator, let me say that I have yet to see a businessman who did not think that the company with which he was connected could do a better job than could any other company. I have never seen a college professor who did not think that his associates could do a better job of training students than could anyone else. I have never seen a Democrat who did not think his party was the best, and I have never seen a Republican who did not think his party was the best. It is human nature.

We must also realize that we are dealing with scholarships, fellowships, and the building up of schools, to a certain extent. All those things enter into it. Therefore the more general the control the better.

Another feature is the appointment by the President of a Foundation consisting of 24 members who, in turn, select an executive committee, all of them being on part-time. The President nominates a director who is answerable only to the Executive Committee which reports only once a year to the Congress. Then there is provision for a full-time board. I find that scientists are rather evenly divided on one of two things: Either a small full-time board appointed by the President, with a director, who devote their entire time to the work, or a director with a fairly sizable advisory board.

There is a second provision in the bill which I think is dangerous, and I want to go into that a little further when we debate it.

I also desire to call the attention of the Senate to a couple of other things. There has been, in my opinion, more misrepresentation on the question of patents than on anything else. The Senate is being led to believe that S. 1850, the bill originally passed last year, was an amendment to the patent law. I have had a great deal of experience with the question of patents and shop rights, as have had other Members of the Senate, during the war, and I had a healthy disrespect for the policies of the United States Government in respect thereto, and a very healthy respect for the policies of American business and various educational institutions with respect thereto.

Never have I attempted to modify the patent law. As a matter of fact, a clause was drawn to get away from any modification because the patent laws of

the United States are now being criticized and are subject to modification if the committee ever gets around to it. But there was an effort made in the bill—and, in my opinion, there must be—to prevent the patenting of inventions perfected with Government money unless there is a contract which has been entered into covering the matter. That applies particularly to cases in which people making the inventions are on the public pay roll. In other words, the theory in S. 1850 was that John Jones agrees to do the work for which he is paid and not to patent anything he produces so that the results of his investigation and his research shall become public property. That is all S. 1850 ever attempted to do. This bill does not do that. One reason, I think, that this must be done is that every department of government has its own policy with reference to the subject.

In 1943 I went with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to Tucson, Ariz., to look over and investigate some complaints with reference to an airfield there. We discovered that one of the causes of the trouble was the fact that a foreman had stolen an invention perfected by a couple of other Government employees and had sold the right to patent to some “gadget” company in Ohio. That had disrupted the morale of the field. Of course, I will admit that the commanding officer was doing many things he should not have done, but it probably never would have stirred up any commotion had it not been for the fact that the foreman had stolen the patent.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The foreman was not from Arizona, was he?

Mr. KILGORE. No. I will have to admit to the Senator from Arizona that the foreman was an importation to his fair State. The only thing I checked up to see was whether he came from my State, and the Senator from Michigan checked up to see whether he was from his State, and we dropped it at that. But I know he was not from Arizona.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. He probably picked it up after he got there.

Mr. KILGORE. I should not be surprised.

Mr. McFARLAND. Possibly he picked it up on the way through Arkansas.

Mr. KILGORE. It is said that everything in Arizona has thorns on it—the cactus, and even the toads—and the thorns pick up things. Of course, I am not referring to the human beings there; I have not seen any thorns on them. Of course, this is all in the spirit of levity.

There is nothing contained in the amendment I have offered which deals with patents, other than to forbid them. If Senators will read the history of the patent monopoly in vitamins, particularly viosterol, they will find it very interesting. Every mother in this country knows the terrific price paid for it. Its purpose is to prevent rickets in children. The invention was made by a couple of scientists on the public pay roll, and

the result of their invention was turned over to another group who eventually capitalized on it to the tune of millions of dollars at the expense of American children. It developed in the Supreme Court of the United States that it was not an invention at all; that the humble farmer, in curing his hay, had long ago discovered it—the sunshine vitamin. In the meantime, thousands of children in the United States had died of rickets and malnutrition because the price of the vitamin was placed too high.

Mr. President, I could go on for the remainder of the afternoon, tomorrow, and the next day citing examples. The only thing that my amendment seeks to do is to prevent people who are working for the Government from patenting anything unless their contract provides for it. It is in order to provide a uniform standard, so that a man working for the Department of the Interior is in the same situation as a man working for the Navy Department or the War Department or any other department. There are cases where people are paid for developing something and then have to pay someone a bonus for using what their money developed.

That, Mr. President, is the second one of the objections I have. It is all left up to the discretion of the nine-man board and the director. They can do anything they want to. They can take the funds of the United States Government and permit anyone a patent except one of their own number.

I suggested to some of the proponents of the bill that it be so amended that no one operating with Government funds could patent any invention.

Let me tell the Senate of the attitude of a private corporation. I shall call names. I will say du Pont, Union Carbide and Chemical, Hayden, or any other research organization in the United States. A man doing research work for a railroad, for instance, signs a contract, before he starts, that all the results of his work shall be forthwith patented by him and the patent sold to the company. I think du Pont is very generous. It gives \$25, but the rest of the companies, I believe, give only \$1. The employee understands that situation, yet he does good work. Nevertheless, I have heard it stated here on the floor of the Senate that financial gain was the incentive for the work done by scientists. Such statements are not true, and scientists should vehemently deny them. I have found that a scientist who is worth his salt will work for the pride of accomplishment and for the record to be gained, and he will work in order to be able to feel, down in his heart, that he has done a good job and has accomplished something for science and something for the people of his country. His feeling is similar to that of any good Member of Congress, whose reward is, and should be, a statement at the end of his term, “Well done, good and faithful servant.” That is all the scientists want, as I have observed them.

As I said yesterday, they are an underpaid group of people. Sometimes I have laughed at the comparison which is to be made, upon examination of Poor's Manual and other financial manuals, between the salaries of vice presidents of

large corporations who are in charge of research and development and the salaries of vice presidents of such organizations who are in charge of the legal divisions, for in making such comparisons we readily observe that the vice presidents in charge of the legal divisions usually receive salaries three times as large as those received by the vice presidents in charge of research and development. Yet the men in research work are usually well satisfied and happy, and they do a good job. So, Mr. President, it is completely inaccurate to say that their primary motive is one of financial gain.

I wish to take up another matter at this point, and I consider it one of the most serious import. I state with the firmest conviction that there is one prime purpose behind this bill, and it is the development of research scientists of the first order. As I have previously stated, eminent scientists, including such men as Dr. Jewett, Dr. Conant, and Dr. Langmuir, tell us that the young scientist is the real basic research man. So it is from the young scientists that we shall obtain our dividends, and it is upon them that the national security will depend in case of another war. The men in that group will be the ones who will maintain our economic security and our prestige as the leading industrial Nation of the world. They will be the ones who will help maintain our leadership in world affairs. If we fail to develop such a group of men, we shall fail to achieve our other objectives, because the nation which can produce a vast group of young men and women who are capable of forging ahead in the development of new ideas for new things and new processes and new substances, will be the leading nation of the world, particularly in view of the fact that the world is becoming more and more short of natural resources.

So, Mr. President, the primary objective of the bill is the training of such young people; and in that connection, one of the basic needs is some place in which to train them, some place to which they can be sent.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question or for a short statement, but I do not yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is not the purpose for which I am asking the Senator to yield. He is making such a splendid and instructive address, that I feel there should be a greater number of Members of the Senate present to hear him. Will the Senator yield, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KILGORE. Very well; I yield for that purpose, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum; and I ask unanimous consent, in that connection, that the Senator from West Virginia shall not lose the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if I yield for that purpose, will I lose the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the Senator from West Virginia can

make his second speech, following the quorum call.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Chair, because I have developed only one-third of my remarks, and after the quorum call I shall wish to proceed with the remainder of what I have to say.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Barkley	Hill	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Russell
Byrd	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Eaton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
George	Maybank	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Young
Hawkes	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated, and then I shall discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, before line 9, it is proposed to insert the following new section 12, and to renumber all ensuing sections:

MANDATORY AMOUNTS TO BE DISTRIBUTED TO THE VARIOUS STATES

"SEC. 12. Of the funds appropriated to the Foundation for research and development activities (excluding funds expressly appropriated for national defense), not less than 25 percent shall be apportioned among the States as follows: One-fourth shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and the remainder shall be apportioned among the States in the proportion that their respective populations bear to the population of all the States, determined according to the last preceding decennial census, of the amount apportioned to each State at least one-half shall be expended only for carrying on research and development activities in the facilities of tax-supported colleges and universities, including the land-grant colleges, within such State pursuant to contracts or other financial arrangements made by the Foundation under this section. The balance of the amount for each State shall be expended only in nonprofit colleges or universities in the States. In making such contracts or other financial arrangements, the Foundation shall give each individual institution the widest latitude in its selection of individual research and development projects but the Foundation shall not be required to expend funds in any institution unless it submits proposals for the expenditure of such funds which the Foundation finds to be consistent with such general program and standards as it may, after receiving the advice of the Board, establish

in order to carry out the objectives and provisions of this act. For purposes of this section the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I desire to discuss the amendment briefly. As I stated before, the primary purpose of the pending bill is the development of competent research workers, with a view to the research work they will do, and the resultant benefits to both American and world civilization. In order to accomplish that purpose, there must be a wider distribution of activities under the bill. A greater number of research institutions must be developed. In other words, the research work must not be allowed to be concentrated in a few institutions. Most of the institutions are State-financed and State-owned; or, as has been repeatedly shown on the floor of the Senate, the institutions are under-financed.

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to assure the development of institutions where young men and young women may receive proper training to qualify them in scientific research, whether the students receive the training under scholarships or as the result of working to obtain the necessary funds with which to attend the schools.

The agricultural colleges have been greatly benefited by the tremendous strides made by the Department of Agriculture in the development of its program. They have cooperated with State educational institutions in developing scientific farmers—young farmers, if Senators please—who have stepped up the production on farms of the United States. The pending measure will extend that type of service in the fields of industry, public health, and various other fields. The number of institutions carrying on this type of work must be expanded. If the bill becomes a "pork barrel," by which a few people hand out money to institutions with which they care to deal, we shall have conditions similar to those which were experienced in the war. I am not criticizing anyone, but the Government agencies had a very limited number of institutions with which to deal. I received constant complaints from engineering colleges throughout the United States and State universities that they could not obtain a part of the research work distributed by the War Department, or by the Office of Scientific Research and Development, and that all such work was being done in a small, hand-picked group of schools, four or five or six of them at the most.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But is there not a great difference between the conditions in wartime and in peacetime? There might be justification in time of war, when there is a necessity for getting results immediately, or within the shortest possible space of time, but such justification may not exist, where there is a long-range program, having in mind not only the work ultimately to be carried on, but

the ability to engage in research work in various institutions. Is there not a great distinction?

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator for his suggestion, because that is the point I am trying to emphasize. We were handicapped during the war and, while I received many complaints, the departments were always able to answer that only at a certain limited number of places were there people who were qualified by training to carry on the particular work. I want to see such training carried on in every State of the Union. I may say, and I think the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, who has had experience in education, will bear me out, that training in research is an indispensable part of the equipment of any teacher in higher education, and that the teacher who is able to conduct independent research makes the best type of teacher obtainable. Training in research is indispensable even to the teacher of law. He must be able to conduct independent research in connection with principles of law. In every branch of education, the men who are to become leaders in the training of our young men must have opportunities such as those to be provided under the pending measure.

The wartime policy was based upon the necessity of accomplishing a great deal in a very short space of time. The proposed program is calculated to accomplish a great deal, but in a much longer time. Therefore, the procedure which was found necessary in time of war should not be considered necessary in connection with the proposed National Science Foundation. Every institution that cares to participate in the program should be allowed to do so. All the competent teachers are not to be found within merely a few large institutions. One of the best engineering students in the country came from a little cross-roads college in the State of Colorado. He has made an outstanding record in the University of Chicago. That is true of other smaller institutions; they produce exceptional students, but they lack facilities, and the students continue their work in the larger schools. The students feel that only in the larger institutions are they able to find facilities for proper research work, and that it is only in the larger institutions that they may advance sufficiently to become teachers and leaders, and to achieve results in keeping with their mental qualifications and the concentration of their efforts.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Is it not correct that, as the bill is now written, it provides for a Foundation composed of 24 men, to be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, for 8-year terms? After confirmation by the Senate and the beginning of the 8-year term, there is no longer any control, or anything of the kind, so far as either the President, the Congress, or the Government is concerned. Is not that true?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. As the bill is now written, the Foundation, consisting of 24 men, names an executive committee of 9 men;

the 9 men being chosen from the membership of 24?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Then, as the bill is now written, the director is named by the membership of 24. Is that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; and, if I may interrupt, the director reports to the President only once a year as to what has been accomplished.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to enable me to correct a misunderstanding? On page 2, paragraph (b) the bill reported by the committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Alabama is a member, provides as follows:

(b) The term of office of each member of the Foundation shall be 8 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and

(2) the terms of office of the members first taking office after the date of enactment of this act shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 6 at the end of 2 years, 6 at the end of 4 years, 6 at the end of 6 years, and 6 at the end of 8 years, after the date of enactment of this act. No person who has served as a member of the Foundation for more than 4 years shall be eligible for reappointment as a member until the expiration of 4 years after the termination of his previous term.

The whole purpose of that is to prevent the kind of permanency which has been criticized by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. But each gets an 8-year term. Of course, I understand that, to begin with, it is sought to stagger the appointments; but, if a man gets a 2-year appointment in the beginning, he can have an 8-year term afterward, can he not?

Mr. SMITH. Conceivably, he might have a 6-year term.

Mr. HILL. He might have another 8 years; and, after he once gets his 8-year term, there is no control at all, is there?

Mr. KILGORE. Except by refusing an appropriation, if I may say so.

Mr. HILL. Of course, Congress will not do that, because Congress will be very much interested in the Foundation. The point I am making is that, as the bill is now written, the full say, control, authority, and power is entirely in the hands of the 24 men. Is that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator that it was intended that the center of gravity of the whole bill should be in the hands of the 24.

Mr. HILL. The bill makes that very clear. What the Senator from West Virginia by his amendment seeks to do is to place some limitation in the bill so as to make certain that all the funds shall not go to a few institutions or to a few places. Is that not correct?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. That is, the amendment would limit what would otherwise be the unlimited discretion of the Foundation. Is that not correct?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. That is what the Senator proposes in his amendment?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The only thing in connection with the Senator's amendment to which I object is that it departs from the theory of establishing the best possible research plan we can establish. Take the cancer division which is proposed to be placed under the National Foundation. So far as I can understand, the general opinion is that there are not more than 10 institutions in the United States sufficiently equipped to do substantial work in the field of cancer. That means that 38 States would not come under the cancer provision. I do not know in which States the 10 institutions are, but if we are concerned about getting the best possible research development it seems to me we must go to those places which are adequately equipped with personnel and technical equipment, but particularly personnel. If Senators insist upon State by State distribution it seems to me that a very large part of the money will be wasted which should be used for the development of a general research program.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I see considerable merit in what the Senator from Ohio has just said. I do not know whether there is some other basis on which to work out the plan which would be better than the basis suggested by the Senator from West Virginia in his amendment. I do not know why we should follow a State by State plan, or a plan fashioned along geographical lines, but I think there is danger in giving wide discretionary powers to the Foundation, for it may result in too great concentration by the Foundation in its allocation of funds to a very few institutions and to a very few places. I should like to see a safeguard provided against such a danger.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield, but I should like to have an opportunity to answer the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I may suggest then a supplemental view respecting that question, that if such a situation should develop—and I do not think it possibly could develop, for I cannot conceive of the 24 men being influenced by any purpose except to obtain the best possible research work in the various fields of science—but if it should so happen that the members of the organization seemed to be unduly influenced, they could always be hedged around by some sort of condition placed in the appropriation bill, if in some year it should develop that such an abuse were developing. But I think it is hardly possible to conceive of such a thing.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that under the Reorganization Act the Senate now is restricted and limited in the matter of hedging, as suggested by the Senator from Ohio, by placing limitations in appropriation bills. The Senate

does not now have the same latitude it enjoyed in the past, because the Reorganization Act very definitely restricts and limits it so far as placing conditions on appropriations is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. I think that even under the Reorganization Act conditions can still be attached respecting the purpose for which the money is to be used.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say further in connection with what the Senator from Ohio has said, that men necessarily think in terms of their experiences, their personal knowledge and their environment. These 24 men, coming from particular institutions or from particular surroundings, are naturally going to think in terms of those institutions and of those surroundings. A distinguished governor of Alabama once served for a short time in the Senate of the United States—the late Governor B. B. Comer. One of his favorite words was “environment.” Men are naturally, subconsciously, we might say, influenced and swayed by the environment in which they live, by the environment from which they came. It is only natural to think that these 24 men will be very much influenced, very much persuaded, by the environment from which they come. They will know that environment, and they will be aware of its problems; they will know the pressures, the needs, the demands of their environment, but they may not know the demands, the pressures, and the needs of the institutions and sections outside of their own environment. If there were something in the bill which would safeguard against such a danger as some of us envisage, if we could make a little more sure that the money will be used more on a national basis, with the whole country in mind, it would be well. It would be a very wise and much-desired thing to do.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to say something in line with what the Senator from Alabama has just said. We had a perfect illustration of what he has spoken of during the war. As Senators know, during the war mica was used for insulation, for resistance purposes, I may say, in many electronic instruments manufactured for use in airplanes and submarines and otherwise. We had for years yielded to the British idea of ocular appeal, that if mica was clear and free from visual cracks it could be used for resistance purposes in the electronic instruments, but if it was spotted or clouded it was of no use in such instruments. That included all the mica mined in the United States. The British idea of ocular appeal was accepted, and it so happened that the only mica of that type came from India and South Africa, and it cost us \$3,000 a ton for shipment alone. A certain young engineer connected with the United States Government decided that if mica was to be used for resistance, why not test it with electricity and see whether the mica mined in the United States could not be used. He went to our Bureau of Standards. The Bureau of Standards listened to his presentation and said his idea and scheme were fine. They said, “We will have to build some machinery and test the mica. We do not have an appropriation to do so. Go down to the Office of Scientific Research and

Development.” So he went down to OSRD. It so happened that the man who had to pass on the question came from the Bell Research Laboratories, and with perfect human characteristics he said that the only place where that matter could be worked out was the Bell Research Laboratories. As a result the problem was sent to the Bell Research Laboratories. There were men in our own Bureau of Standards who said they could work out the problem within 60 days. A machine was perfected which showed that our mica was just as good as the British mica. But at that time the test had to be made at the Bell Research Laboratories because the men to whom the problem was submitted came from those laboratories. The Bell Laboratories man was sincere. He had worked in the laboratories. He was imbued with the idea that the men in those laboratories were the only men who really knew electronics and could conduct the tests successfully.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know of any youth who went to college who, when he graduated and left it, did not feel that, after all, though it may not have been the richest college and may not have been the greatest, it was just about the best college in the United States? That is the spirit of those who leave college, is it not?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Is there anything in the Senator's amendment which would compel the apportionment of the money available in equal portions for every type of research?

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, no; nothing whatsoever, I may say to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCFARLAND. In other words, the States could be picked out for the work which their institutions might be best equipped to carry on?

Mr. KILGORE. I will explain that a little later. That will be found in the wording of the amendment.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Is it not true that some States have institutions equipped to perform certain types of research work?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I contend that there are certain types of work that the institutions in the State of Arizona are better equipped to do than those of other States. So the argument of the Senator from Ohio falls by its own weight.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Arizona for pointing that out. I had intended to enter that field of discussion, and I shall do it now. First, however, I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that I appreciate the sincerity of his suggestion, but I should like to call one historical fact to his attention. When we were young I believe everyone in the northern part of the United States, when something became seriously wrong with him, went to Johns Hopkins in Baltimore to have his case diagnosed. Later there was a school

established in Louisiana known as Tulane University, which had a couple of large hospitals connected with it, and many persons, when they became ill, went to the hospitals connected with Tulane University. Then a couple of brothers by the name of Mayo built a clinic in Minnesota. We heard about the Mayo Clinic, and people started going there. Then the University of Virginia gradually built up, and people began to go to hospitals in Charlottesville, as the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] knows. In the home town of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], there grew up the Cleveland Clinic. All this shows that such programs spread with proper opportunity.

Mr. President, this bill does not provide an arbitrary distribution of all funds. It is not arbitrary in the least. It provides that 25 percent of certain types of funds shall be distributed in order to make sure that every school has an opportunity to do what it can do best, and to develop itself in that field, so as to obtain the distribution we need. If we are to rely on doing all our engineering at MIT, if another war comes along all the enemy will have to do will be to blow up MIT, and we shall be out of the war. If we limit it to MIT and the Sheffield School at Yale, we shall be in the same difficulty. We might branch out and limit it to MIT, Sheffield, Harvard, and Princeton. We would still be in trouble.

As was well stated by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], every State has scientific and technical problems. The problems of my State lie in the field of coal, oil, natural gas, and related matters requiring geological research, investigation of various sands, and so forth. A great deal of excellent research work can be done in that State along those lines.

The State of Kentucky is in the same situation. The State of Florida is interested in a number of things. All the States have programs which they can further. This amendment provides one thing to which I wish to call attention. We do not arbitrarily dish out the money to the schools and the States. We do not arbitrarily hand them so much and say, “Do as you please with this. This is only a little subsidy.” Under the terms of the amendment, which is carefully worded, the institution involved must first submit to the scientists a comprehensive project and program, showing what they can do by way of research, and much money will be required. Then and then only can they be assigned definite work to do, a definite part of the program. There is an incentive to build up. There may be an incentive to spread cancer research a little more widely, because I find that people in my State suffer from cancer too. Regardless of the perfect health of the inhabitants of my State, they occasionally have lung trouble, and also a little heart trouble.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator indicated one of the answers to the observation of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. In a program such as cancer research, the Senator's amendment would not require that even 25 percent of the

cancer funds be distributed among all the States. That is an over-all requirement as to the entire program. I think a somewhat fuller answer is required.

I think the Senator is quite right as to the part of the program designed to achieve immediate results in the way of physical inventions or discoveries; but equally important is the development of further facilities. As I conceive this program, I am sure that that is part of it, as indicated by the provision for scholarships, study, and so forth. That part of the program is not designed to produce immediately a new bomb or a new kind of nuclear fission. A very important part of the program is to give an opportunity to talented people in many parts of the country who cannot attend the large institutions. Within the past month I have received numerous requests for assistance in getting constituents into large schools. I am sure that other Senators have had similar requests. I have received several with respect to MIT. I received one today for Columbia. I have received 20 or 30 such requests. Almost without exception they cannot get into those schools.

No one will deny that the genius of this country is that brains can be found anywhere, in any part of the country. It is true that in past years, after a person had been discovered to have conspicuous abilities, the tendency was to drift into the larger communities where the rewards were greater. I think that is true today. But it is very difficult to continue that process.

It seems to me that it is important, for the long-term future, to provide an opportunity to discover and bring to the fore unusually gifted individuals in the States. I would not favor a program under which all the funds must be divided in this way; but the restriction applies to only 25 percent, with the further proviso that if a State presents a program, that program may still be turned down as not being acceptable. I believe that the development of young scientists in the future, who may grow up in any part of the country, is an essential part of the program.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I wish first to answer the Senator from Arkansas, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The 25-percent limitation applies to such funds as may be appropriated for the Foundation. If money should be turned over by the War Department for special research, the 25-percent restriction would not apply to such funds. If money for cancer research should be contributed, the 25-percent restriction would not apply to it. It would apply only to money appropriated for the general use of the Foundation. The purpose of the Foundation is development. The proviso is very clear. A minimum of one-half of the money apportioned to be used in the States shall be used in land-grant colleges and State-owned institutions. There is some laxity there. If the land-grant colleges and State institutions have the facilities and the program, the entire amount can be given

to them. Anything that is left may be used in nonprofit, privately owned institutions in the State.

The reason for this provision is that the State universities and land-grant colleges have always carried on programs of scientific training, to a much greater extent than have privately owned nonprofit institutions. The land-grant colleges have carried on agricultural and engineering programs in the States. In fact, they were subsidized for that purpose by the Federal Government. That was the reason for giving them first priority. If they could not absorb the amounts allotted for their projects, any balance would go to nonprofit schools.

The reason for the 25-percent limitation was that 75 percent would be utterly free, to be used anywhere—to be sent to a private laboratory if it were necessary to work on a serum or on a weapon for the Army, to work on a new development in engines, or something of that sort. But only 25 percent is set aside for the development of places to train those in whom we are primarily interested, the scientists.

The amendment also provides that the Foundation itself must decide whether or not each institution is capable of carrying out its program, and whether or not it has a proposal.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Let us assume that the appropriation will be \$20,000,000 the first year. Perhaps that is all that can be used from year to year. The \$20,000,000 is to be divided into little pieces. This organization is not to be engaged in research in general. It will confine itself to particular subjects of research; and to conduct research into those particular subjects it will be necessary to go to the particular places where there are scientists who know something about the particular subjects. If it is desired to train workers in a particular field, they must be sent to the places where there are those who know something about that subject. The \$20,000,000 would be divided into many small pieces. Twenty-five percent of \$20,000,000 is \$5,000,000. By the time we are through, many States may be entitled to only \$10,000. For what? It will not be a bit of help in the particular research in which the Foundation is then engaged. It will be that much money thrown away.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I take issue with the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. The purpose is not to build up a great many colleges all over the United States, or enable them to increase their facilities. This country is in need of research development in connection with the different problems which it wishes to solve. In the case of half the States the money for particular projects, so far as the interest the Foundation has in them is concerned, would be wasted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if this work is worth doing—and I think that all of us agree that it is—it is worth doing well. The fault is not to be found

in the method of allocating the funds as proposed by the Senator from West Virginia and others, including myself, but in the total inadequacy of the amount provided. I certainly should hope that in such an important matter as this, on which the fate of this country and the welfare of its people may depend, we will not be niggardly in the future in appropriating for this purpose. I do not believe that the work can adequately be done for \$20,000,000, but I think that is much better than nothing at all, which is what we have today. I believe we should provide an adequate appropriation, possibly eventually ten times \$20,000,000. When it comes to passing along the amount allocated to the State colleges and other colleges where the work is more concentrated, it should be sufficient to contribute materially to the objective which we seek, which is the highest development of scientific research, particularly basic research.

I should like to call the Senate's attention to one thing which no Senator has before mentioned. The boys who have come back from the service are, for the most part, intensely interested in scientific research and development. Sixty-one percent of the GI's who are benefiting through the GI bill of rights in securing a higher education are attending State-controlled institutions. Thirty-nine percent of them are attending private institutions. I think that fact alone should convince us that we should make a reasonable amount of this sum available to colleges in every State. I do not regard that as a distribution of funds at all. I advocate it simply because many of the greatest inventions in our time have come from sparsely settled rural areas, from the poorest States of the Union. The benefits become concentrated and manufacturing becomes concentrated in large centers of population, but many of the inventions have come from rural areas. In my own State the Fairbanks scale was invented and developed and is still manufactured there, and John Deere, who was the father of modern farm machinery, started from scratch in a small Vermont town. Many machine-tool inventions have come from a plant of which my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] was president for a long time. The plant is located in a small Vermont town. The boys and girls from small towns and from farms are often of a more inventive nature—because they have to be—than some of their brothers and sisters who are raised under more auspicious conditions and with what would seemingly be a better opportunity in life. So I do not think that we are doing wrong in allocating to all the States money which can be concentrated in half a dozen scientific colleges. We have established the policy of giving boys and girls from all sections, even the poor sections of our country, an opportunity to share in the benefits and to make their contribution toward bettering their country, and the whole world, for that matter.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement on this matter?

Mr. KILGORE. I will yield for a short statement.

Mr. SMITH. I want to try to iron out what seems to be the confusion which seems to have arisen in the discussion at the moment. I am a member of the committee along with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] and I share with him the feeling that all our young people must be given equality of opportunity in educational areas. This bill has not that objective. It is primarily a bill providing for basic research in the sciences, to find the projects in the field of science which should be pursued in the national welfare. We have discussed the matter for 2 years. We have provided for scholarships and fellowships to be awarded by a special division of the Foundation in any part of the United States where promising young scientists appear. We have had the question up time and time again, and we finally decided that the way to deal with it was to have a Foundation of sufficient size, whose members should be appointed by the President, that would represent all corners of the country, so that the Foundation would be able to determine where the basic projects were and where were the promising young scientists. Therefore in section 3 of the bill it is provided specifically that—

The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences—

This is the important point—

Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

We felt that the best way to deal with the question which we are discussing now was to put the responsibility on a group of eminent persons—they are not all scientists; some are in public affairs—who would search the country over from one end to the other to discover what are the basic steps in science which should be pursued and subsidized by the Government, and, secondly, to locate promising young persons who should be given the aid needed in order to develop science.

I submit that we have come to the right decision in not making the distribution on a State-wide basis and putting the responsibility in the group which the President appoints to make the selection both of projects and of the young people we want to train in this field.

I think that is the main issue in this immediate discussion, and I cannot see the justification for feeling that through this bill we should try to aid institutions all over the Nation, much as I favor that. We are dealing with that question in other bills in other ways. This bill is aimed to develop basic research in fundamental science.

I will add also, if I may—

Mr. KILGORE. I did not know that the Senator was going to make a speech.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will yield, there is one provision to which I should like to call attention in this connection. It was suggested by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Thomas], who is greatly in-

terested in the subject and who is not here today. We wrote into the bill, on pages 18 and 19, at his suggestion, this paragraph which I should like to read in order to show that we were carrying through the idea of finding areas of research.

Paragraph (h) of section 15 reads as follows:

(h) In making contracts or other arrangements for scientific research, the Foundation shall utilize appropriations available therefor in such manner as will in its discretion best realize the objectives of (1) having the work performed by organizations, agencies, and institutions, or individuals, including Government agencies, qualified by training and experience to achieve the results desired, (2) strengthening the research staff of organizations, particularly nonprofit organizations, in the States and Territories and the District of Columbia, (3) aiding institutions, agencies, or organizations which if aided will advance further research, and (4) encourage the growth of independent research by individuals.

The point is that we want a selected approach to this subject, and not a wide, general approach, distributing funds all over the United States.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful that I have finally "smoked out" the ultimate objective of the proponents of the bill, which strengthens my efforts to have these amendments adopted. I say to you, Mr. President, the opinion that has just been stated by the Senator from New Jersey is not the opinion which prevails in the colleges and universities and among the educators of the United States, and the representation the Senator from New Jersey has just made is not the one which has been made to them by Dr. Bush or Dr. Conant or Dr. Bowman or various other of our outstanding scientists. The aim and purpose which have been stated by the Senator from New Jersey are not the ultimate aim and purpose of the Foundation as represented to the public at large. If the ultimate aim and purpose are as stated by the Senator from New Jersey, then the pending bill, if enacted, will represent the biggest steal that has ever been perpetrated, and I say that advisedly. If the results of the research and invention that are to be carried on and developed by the use of Government funds are to be patented for private gain, what will the result be? There has been no resistance to any proposed prohibition against the taking out of private patents based on the results of the proposed research. Also, Mr. President, what will we do when the research men of today, whom we now favor so much, die? Where will the new group of scientists come from? Are we to presume that the brains of this world are to be found only in a few places? I admit that some people think so, but I deny it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I refuse to yield. I have already yielded for too many speeches. I shall conclude my remarks in a few moments.

Mr. President, the proposal is that only 25 percent of the total fund be used for the development of scientists who will carry on a long-range program. Apparently, we are still proceeding under

the impetus of some war thoughts which made the National Academy of Sciences ineffective, and made the Research Council of World War I ineffective, and made the Office of Scientific Research and Development ineffective in the last war, because those organizations sought results in the way of inventions.

Mr. President, I hope and pray that the Congress of the United States is not simply trying to have certain inventions and discoveries made. I do not think that is what we should seek to achieve. I think our principal objective is to develop a group of scientists who will be able to make inventions and discoveries. I think we should treat fairly these allegedly incompetent State educational institutions, which some persons seek to discredit and disqualify. If I were to propose that 25 percent of the fund be given to the States, I would be doing exactly what some persons claim as the purpose of the bill—namely, to give these funds to a few selected groups.

Mr. President, the Senators who now are opposed to my views admit there will be no general participation. As a result, we now can see that if they have their way, there will be no general distribution in regard to the membership of the proposed boards. If that is the purpose of this measure, I shall join in the war cry of the Senators on the other side of the aisle in 1946, who shouted to the high heavens, "No more subsidies"—because if those on the other side of this issue have their way all this bill will provide will be a subsidy for present profit, rather than a fund to be used to build up a cadre and personnel of scientists who can make real progress in the advancement of science for the United States, to make and keep the United States the outstanding Nation of the world in respect to scientific progress and invention. Mr. President, such progress will not be made if we begin by looking for a few new drugs or a few doorbells or some new mouse traps or a new rat poison or a few new serums; for under a similar procedure, later on we would find, as we did during the last war, that we had obsolete tanks and obsolete airplanes. In the last war, the only thing that saved us, and that was not obsolete, was the American boy. Thank God, Mr. President, he had brains because he came from all over the United States. He was not obsolete; he kept abreast of developments because he had intelligence. If we had waited for the veterans of the First World War to win the Second World War, using the inventions developed in the First World War, the United States would have lost the war. But with our boys, using the adaptations and implementations of foreign research, we developed the tools and the machinery with which we won the war.

Now we are trying to win the peace and to build up a peaceful army of scientists. If we confine to one or two institutions the recruiting depots for that army, God help the United States of America, Mr. President. If in connection with this bill, we depart from the proper policy and principle, we shall have deceived the honest scientific societies and educational societies, so far as this bill is con-

cerned, and we shall have foisted upon the American people an improper thing.

So, Mr. President, I desire to move the adoption of this amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who wishes to discuss the amendment for a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield the floor?

Mr. KILGORE. I do.

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from West Virginia, as I understood him, stated that by not distributing the proposed fund to all the States the promising students in certain States will not receive proper consideration. Mr. President, let us consider this matter realistically. For instance, let us consider a student in a university in the State of Vermont, to which the Senator from Vermont has referred. Let us assume that the student is one whom the Government seeks to train in medical sciences. Then the question should be, What is the best way to make him a research man in medical sciences? The obvious answer, in all probability, is that he should not be left in the State of Vermont, but should be sent to Johns Hopkins or to one of half a dozen leading medical schools in the United States. That, of course, is where the boy himself would wish to go. If he wanted to become a research man in the physical sciences, he would wish to go to the University of California or to one of half a dozen other outstanding institutions which deal with that particular field; and a similar situation would apply to other fields. Such a procedure would not be discrimination.

On the other hand, if instead of following that procedure, an attempt were made to build up in Vermont a research medical institution where he could be taught to be a research man, and if corresponding attempts were made in all the other States of the Union, the total cost would be 100 times as much, and in the long run the education such young men received would not be the education and training they wished to have.

In many fields, Vermont may have the proper institutions to which we would send men from other States. But the idea that it is necessary to distribute this money by States, in order to develop research, seems to be entirely mistaken.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Washington has the floor, but while I am on my feet I wish to say that the Senator said his purpose was to establish a proper environment. My whole purpose in connection with this bill is the establishment of environment, and now the question is whether it will be a scientific environment or a political environment. That is the main issue which is presented by the amendments of the Senator from West Virginia. If we are going to do this job on a scientific basis, then we wish to subsidize the institutions

in which there is the possibility of making the fundamental discoveries and research which are provided for in this bill.

Similarly, in the case of the other amendments, it seems to me that if we wish to develop a scientific environment we had better give all the power to the 24 scientists and let them handle the entire matter. I am in favor of keeping scientists out of politics, but I also am in favor of keeping politicians out of science; and that is the main issue which is presented by the amendments offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The organization set up under the provisions of the pending bill should be a scientific organization conducted by scientists, who will appoint their own Director and will distribute the money on a scientific basis to the institutions where the best scientific research will be done and where a sound scientific research staff, on which the success of the program will depend, will be developed. We shall waste the money if we try to have the program handled on a political, pork-barrel basis of having so much disbursed in each State. Personally, I do not care whether Ohio gets any of the money, unless Ohio has an institution which is outstanding in some particular field for which funds are requested.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that the boys and girls of Vermont and other States can study medical research at the medical college of the University of Vermont just as well as they can at New Haven or at Boston or at Baltimore or anywhere else; in fact, some of the greatest physicians and surgeons of the United States have been educated at the University of Vermont.

I recall one eye surgeon who received his early training at the University of Vermont, to whom people came from all over the world, including the King of Siam, who came a few years ago to have an operation on his eyes. Even before the GI bill of rights went into effect, the medical college of the University of Vermont, which has the same rating in the medical world, I believe, as do the medical schools of Yale and Harvard and one or two other New England colleges, had applications for admission from several times as many boys and girls from all over the United States as the college was able to accept. It can accommodate only about 60 freshmen a year. It always has several times that number of applications.

I recall that recently the university was chosen by some foundation to continue experiments in child nutrition, and some pamphlets have been printed showing the results of that research work, which is extremely important, and which was conducted by the medical college of the University of Vermont.

I am frank to say, Mr. President, that I want that college to have the right, and the boys and girls who attend that college to have the right, to carry on the research work envisaged in the bill. I do not want to have it taken from Burlington, Vt. I do not want the right to continue medical research work taken away from the University of Vermont, or the

University of Arkansas, or the University of Washington, and concentrated in three or four medical colleges of the United States. I realize that 75 percent of the amount sought to be appropriated under the bill and under the amendment may be given to half a dozen medical colleges or scientific schools, but I do want the other 25 percent to be made available to provide opportunity for the young people of rural areas, who in many cases are just as scientifically minded as are young people in the cities.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that while I appreciate the fact that he admits that perhaps Vermont might have something good to teach, and West Virginia might not have anything to teach, what he complains of is taken out of the bill by the amendment. I do not want the trial-and-error method adopted, requiring the institutions to be certified, and then the projects which can best pay be listed, and the money set aside for those projects and those projects only.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to the observations of the Senator from Vermont, I do not really look upon what is proposed as something for the benefit of Vermont, or of Arkansas, or of any other State. I really believe it is very important that access be afforded to these various institutions from the point of view of the national problem. In other words, it is the Nation as a whole from which the brains will come. I do not know that it is of any particular benefit to Vermont, as Vermont, as much as it is to the whole Nation. It is an integral part of the national program that access be afforded to the brains of Vermont in this direct way.

The Senator turns the proposal about, presenting it as if he were thinking only of building up Vermont. Obviously, from what the Senator says, the University of Vermont does not need assistance. There are applications for admission to that university by three or four times as many as the university can take care of, and Vermont is a thrifty and a relatively wealthy State. The important thing is to make Vermont available to the program. I think every State has some program, or at least a prospect of some program.

It occurred to me, while the Senator was talking, that many years ago a young Jew came to Arkansas from abroad, and while he is on the pay roll of the university, the general education board has supplied him funds for experimentation in nutrition, in which he uses white rats, and he has become one of the greatest authorities in that particular field. It is a small operation, involving, if I recall correctly, about \$6,000 a year, furnished by the Board, which finances the purchase of the rats which are the subject of the experiments. I think a little money, such as the Senator from Ohio mentioned, can do much in many special cases all over the United States.

What the Senator has in mind is the development of another atomic bomb or another proximity fuze. That is one phase, I grant, but a very special phase, and I do not see that that is the only phase, or even the most important one.

Furthermore, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] spoke about not wanting any politics in this undertaking. There certainly was politics in the development of the atomic bomb. If it had not been for politicians in the Senate and politicians in the White House we would not have had the atomic bomb. The same is true of the proximity fuze. As one of the best politicians in the world from any point of view, I do not see why the Senator from Ohio would so object to politicians having something to do with the program. I think politicians have added a great deal to the vigor of such programs, both in wartime and in peacetime.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think there was any politics in the development of the atomic bomb.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have heard the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEL-LAR] time and again relate the details of the financing of the development of the atomic bomb.

Mr. TAFT. The administration got behind it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The administration is composed of politicians.

Mr. TAFT. There was no distribution of a fund among 48 State offices and no effort to divide up the money. It was applied to the particular purpose designated.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The politicians made the decisions and supplied the money, which was the real risk that was taken. The Senator has heard the senior Senator from Tennessee tell on various occasions about how he lay awake at night thinking of it, and all that. I grant it was a great responsibility to undertake to spend \$2,000,000,000 without the consent of the Congress. Members of Congress and the Executive took that responsibility. They were politicians. There is a tendency always to think that if politicians have anything to do with a thing it is necessarily bad.

My remarks particularly are directed to the administrative features of the bill. If we insulate the organization from all influence of public men—if Senators do not like the word "politicians," let us say "statesmen"—if we attempt to prevent any statesman of the Congress or of the executive branch having anything to do with the matter it seems to me we go too far.

I do not think the record during the war of the influence which this body of Senators exerted, justifies the idea that we must completely eliminate the influence of the politicians, or statesmen. I do not think the Senator himself feels that because we in this body, or the Executive, might have some influence, it is necessarily bad.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is bad if we are in a position where we have to claim money for our States. If a certain amount is to be allocated to Ohio, I will have every college in Ohio after me to

get the director, or the President, who would control the director under the proposed amendment, to get money for my State. That is politics.

The Foundation will go to the Committee on Appropriations and say, "Here is a project we need money for next year," and the Committee on Appropriations, or the Bureau of the Budget, will approve the particular project.

I think we should keep our hands off. I think we should turn the matter over to the Foundation, and let them work it out in the best possible way, without pressure being brought by any Senator, which is bound to occur, if we are to appropriate money to be prorated among the States. We cannot help it, if there is money to be distributed by someone subject to the President's order on the basis of a certain amount going to every State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Ohio has just said any Senator who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations will be approached.

Mr. TAFT. I would not ask where the contracts were to be let, or anything about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Senators will be asked to see that the Appropriations Committee acts. They are not going to get away from their responsibility as Members of the Senate, one way or the other.

Mr. TAFT. I think that under the committee bill I shall be relieved very largely of any responsibility to get money for Ohio as against some other State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think Senators should approach the matter in that spirit. I do not think they do. We have had the land-grant colleges for 75 years, and nobody bothers us about getting money for them. They do not bother me; they have had assistance for many years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if all the other States have now been heard from, I should like to proceed for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it seems to me Senators are becoming unduly excited about the amendment. A similar provision was included in the bill last year. On the question involved, the argument which has just been heard has been proceeding for 2½ years, in a hundred conferences, in meetings where witnesses were heard, and in a great many public gatherings, formal and informal. What the Senator from Ohio said is true, or it might be true if the great over-all projects could be left in the hands of the Foundation.

I may say that, after 2½ years of discussion with Senators, scientists, and everyone else, this is about the first time the Senator from New Jersey and I seem to disagree. At least, we have not yet come to an agreement. Why the provision was not placed in the bill again this year, I do not know, because last year there was agreement upon the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia. The Senate agreed by a substantial majority, I think. If I recall correctly, there was a yea-and-nay vote.

If there were to be the over-all projects, and if only \$20,000,000 were to be spent, the argument by the Senator from Ohio and other Senators might be well taken. But, Mr. President, if that is all that is to be spent in connection with this matter, the bill might as well be thrown out the window now. If, in order to keep abreast of the world scientifically, there is not to be spent upon research in this country more than \$20,000,000 a year, or, as I said, more than the cost of a cruiser, then we had better quit. Although there will be great over-all projects, the real purpose of the bill is to correlate, in small areas and in small projects, all over the United States, all types and forms of scientific research. As certain scientists who were in the gallery yesterday and who may be in attendance today will tell you, Mr. President, the atomic bomb and the proximity fuze were not developed entirely at any one place. The scientists engaged in that work were spread all over the United States, but there was a correlating division. The product was manufactured at two places. The scientists came from universities and colleges, and from the nooks and corners of all the United States.

The amendment does not provide that one-fourth of the funds, whether it be one-fourth of \$20,000,000, or one-fourth of \$200,000,000, or whatever may be appropriated, shall go to the 48 States. It merely says that one-fourth shall be distributed in a certain way among the States and universities that send scientists to develop the great over-all projects of which the Senator from Ohio speaks. It merely means that such States have an opportunity to be heard, and to present research plans to the Foundation. If a plan thus presented fits into the over-all plan, or if it be a special, isolated plan, then an allocation may be made for it from one-fourth of the money. There is nothing serious about that. Seventy-five percent of the fund may well go, as I have said to the Senator from New Jersey, to the Ivy League colleges; that would be all right with me; but one-fourth of it could be distributed in the manner indicated, if a plan is presented that correlates with the over-all plan, and if it is a specific project that is worth while, whether it be from West Virginia, or whether it be—and I might as well include my State too—from the State of Washington, or from the State of Rhode Island. It means that the plan may be presented and, if it coordinates with the plan of the Foundation in the selection of individual research and development projects, then those presenting the plan are entitled to dip into 25 percent of the fund. It is not serious; it merely allows the entire country to have an opportunity to participate. That is the best way I can express it.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I first yield to the Senator from Wyoming, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I notice the Senator says, in defense of the amendment, that it is not serious, as though perhaps there were something questionable about it. As I understand the amendment, it is not only not serious, it is very essential that an amendment of this kind be adopted, if we are going to make the facilities available to all the States of the Union and all the schools of the Union, as listed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mean that it is not serious to the over-all project, or to over-all plans.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator means that it does not hinder the over-all project at all, but rather advances it; does he not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It advances it. It affords an opportunity for development along the lines that were followed during the war of enlisting the efforts of people from all over the country. It does not by one iota interfere with fellowships or scholarships.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator what objection is raised against the amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The principal objection partly comes from those who believe it might become some sort of political thing; that people from different States and universities might come forward and say to their Senators, "You have got to get 25 percent of these funds, or our share of 25 percent of the funds." The amendment does not contemplate that at all. It merely says that unless a State, for example the State of Wyoming, has a plan fitting into the over-all project of the Foundation, it is not entitled to anything at all. The Foundation, in the last analysis, directs the distribution of the moneys, regardless of anything that may have been said. I think the Senator from West Virginia will agree with me on that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether there is anything in the bill as now drafted, without the amendment, which would prohibit the selection of a college in a particular State that might have a program fitting into the over-all program?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; nothing at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. But under the amendment it would be compulsory that 25 percent of the fund be scattered among the 48 States?

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the plans presented by the 48 States and by the institutions within the States could and would coordinate with the over-all plan of the Foundation, yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill as drafted makes it a matter of discretion, whereas the Senator's amendment makes it mandatory?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I want to answer the question of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall yield the floor, with just a concluding remark.

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to answer the Senator's question before the Senator from Washington yields the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to say to the Senator from Michigan, in answer to his question, that 25 percent of the fund is set up for use by educational institutions within the various States for research work, but before any of it can be used, a plan acceptable to the Foundation must be presented. Under the original provision, the Foundation could spend the whole sum in one college, if it wanted to.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will yield, I should like to ask whether, under the bill, the Foundation may not, in its discretion, allow funds to go to any college within the United States?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the amendment here proposed would compel them to seek various colleges with which to spend 25 percent of the fund?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would compel them to determine if a certain plan would fit in with the over-all plan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is correct.

That would make it mandatory.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield the floor, with this observation: As I say, this is an amendment that has been long discussed by Senators, by scientists, and by many other persons interested in the matter, and which, after all the discussions, was finally placed by the Senate in last year's bill. The Senate placed the stamp of approval upon it. I hope, as I said earlier in the day, that nothing will be done that will impair the basic purpose of the bill. I think the amendment helps to carry out the basic purposes of the bill, including the wide distribution of research and the wide distribution of opportunity to develop the scientific potentiality of America.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming raised the question a moment ago as to why anybody should oppose the amendment. I regret the distinguished Senator was not here when I tried to state what the proponents of the bill felt was the right approach to the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I say in explanation of my absence that I was in attendance on the session of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SMITH. I am fully aware that when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is not present in the Senate Chamber he is engaged in most important service of the United States Government, and I understand his position perfectly. But in answer to his question, why anybody should oppose the amendment, I wanted to say briefly that those of us who proposed the pending bill, and those of us who voted in committee to report the bill, have been aware of the continuance of debate over the entire period of 2 years on this very question. The question is: What is the purpose of the bill? The purpose of the bill is not primarily to help all the educational institutions of the country. The purpose of the bill is to locate basic research projects in science for the benefit of all the people of the country. Its purpose is not to scatter fire all over the country to see if we can ignite something here or there or some other place.

The purpose is to locate basic research projects and then subsidize such projects.

Our second purpose is to locate promising young students who may become scientists, and assist them.

Mr. President, we purposely placed in the bill, in section 3, as I previously read, the provision that in connection with the appointment of the 24 individuals who are to constitute the Foundation and who are to determine policy, discover the projects, and find promising young scientists—

The President is requested, in the making of nominations of persons for appointment as members, to give due consideration to any recommendations for nomination which may be submitted to him by the National Academy of Sciences, Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, the National Association of State Universities, or by other scientific or educational organizations.

We are putting members on this foundation who will study the entire country and find places where the money can be spent most profitably, without scattering it loosely all over the country in the hope that it may gather fire somewhere and do something.

I realize the position of the Senator from Wyoming. He thinks we should encourage scientific research in every State of the Union, and I agree with him. But we cannot start this project in such a way without getting into far greater trouble by reason of the expenditure of more funds than can be justified. If we do not receive substantial appropriations, the small amount that might go to each State would be hardly worth while. I have before me some tables which I shall not place in the Record, but which show that on the basis of \$10,000,000 distributed throughout the States on the formula proposed by the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, we would have variations in amounts granted for teachers from Alaska, where there are very few teachers, of \$4,800 each, to Maryland, where there are 1,770 teachers, of \$90 per teacher for research work. The formula of distributing the money by States under the plan proposed by the amendment is not sound. The money must be distributed in a totally different manner than that proposed by the amendment. We must begin by getting the very best brains we can to direct the work of the Foundation, and have them determine the policies and the projects, and then have them come to the Congress and say, "This is our program for 1948. These are the young persons we have discovered who should have our assistance as students and scholars and fellows. We ask for so much money for this project next year, so much money the year following, and so much money the year following that." Ultimately, we may get money for this purpose for every State in the Union. But if we scatter our fire in every State of the Nation, my opinion is that we will jeopardize the project in its very inception, because it will simply be the handing out of money to each State by reason of the pressure put upon us. It will not be the development of projects which mean so much for the welfare of the country. That is the theory of those of us who oppose the

amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from New Jersey always makes himself very clear.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the record of the development of State universities in this Nation is a record which controverts every argument the Senator makes. These State universities have prospered and grown and expanded in the realm of education more than all the endowed universities in the United States have done. The frontier now is the frontier of science. I come from an area which 50 years ago or 75 years ago was beyond the frontier, and people who were seeking new opportunities could with certainty go out beyond the Mississippi River and the Missouri River in the knowledge that they would obtain opportunities there to build new homes and create new means of livelihood. But those opportunities have now passed. If we are to develop in the future, the development must be by way of expansion of the frontier of science.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Within the past 3 or 4 weeks news has come from Soviet Russia that a great program has been undertaken by the Government of Russia to develop the mineral resources of the Russian territory. There have been suggestions made here that we should do likewise. Last year I had the opportunity of standing upon the Senate floor to urge the passage of what was known as the Stock Piling Act. It was adopted. It is the law. That law authorizes the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake work intended to develop our sources of strategic and critical materials. In every one of the Western States and in many of the other States of the Union there are undeveloped resources which science can make available. I know of no reason why in passing the bill we should not adopt the formula contained in the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, that if the schools in the various States can present plans which conform to the plan laid down by the Foundation, that 25 percent of the fund can properly be held for use in those States. The important thing, it seems to me, Mr. President, is to bring about the distribution among the people of the United States of the opportunities of securing scientific training and education.

Mr. SMITH. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that it is a question of method. I agree with everything the Senator has said about the importance of these State institutions, but the question is whether we are going to say, "We shall distribute funds to every State in the Union," or whether we are going to have a board or cabinet selected which represents all these groups, which shall decide where to begin. The question is: Do we want to give funds to every institution? Or do we want to select 10 this year, 20 next year, and, as we progress, select more? Or do we want to say that we shall start with a smaller amount for each one? Or shall we concentrate on our research? That is the problem.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It seems to me the answer to the question which the Senator asks is found in the provision that the institutions, to qualify for a part of this distribution, must present a plan which is acceptable to the Foundation.

Mr. SMITH. That is true the way the bill reads now, but it is not mandatory that we have to give money to every State. There is very little difference when we come to the application of the plan, but there is a great difference when it comes to the matter of principle.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Are the figures which the Senator gave based on a \$20,000,000 estimate?

Mr. SMITH. The figures are based on the assumption of a \$40,000,000 total contribution from the Government, and an allocation of 25 percent thereof to all the States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has given a very good example of how the proposition would work out. The Senator said that in the Territory of Alaska, \$4,800 would be allotted to each teacher. Unless the University of Alaska, located far north of Nome, could fit into the overall plan of the Foundation, its teachers would not receive the \$4,800. I stood on the floor of the Senate a year ago and pleaded with the United States Senate to add to an appropriation bill the sum of \$10,000 to continue the geophysical laboratory at the University of Alaska which had made a great contribution to the study of geophysics of the entire Arctic in which military maneuvers are now taking place, and in connection with which the results of the work of that university are being utilized.

Mr. SMITH. I recall supporting the Senator when he raised that point.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. The way our bill is drawn, that is exactly what would happen. The institution would present its case to the 24 members of the Foundation, and they, I presume, would give their approval to that project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The plan of the University of Alaska would have fitted into any kind of over-all plan.

Mr. SMITH. If it came into an over-all plan it would be limited, whereas if it placed its case before the Board it could receive the sort of appropriation the Senator suggests. It is simply a matter of approach.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator a moment ago said something about \$90. I should like to know what figures the Senator had in mind, so as to have the record made clear.

Mr. SMITH. The figures are based on the plan of apportioning money to the various States, the number of available teachers in each of the States, and the allocations to teachers.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is speaking of the number of available college teachers?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator attempt to represent to this body that

under my amendment the money would be allotted in such a way that each teacher would receive a slice of it?

Mr. SMITH. Of course not. The study is based upon available teachers.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The point I wish to make clear is that a certain amount would be allotted to each State if it could furnish a project which was acceptable.

I will say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that the only difference between our two theories is this: As was well expressed by the Senator yesterday, we are going ahead by trial and error. I am trying to remove any possibility of one error. I want to make sure that one error will not occur.

Some of the smaller colleges are doing very fine work. I was talking recently about a very small college in the State of Colorado of which I had never heard. I discovered that some of the things which were done in the field of engineering by that little college were outstanding. They were not publicized. I do not refer to the Colorado State School of Mines. It is a much smaller school. It is rarely heard of. A college like that might present a program. It might get an appropriation and it might not. If it could present an acceptable program involving a certain amount of funds, the Foundation would be bound to grant the funds. There would be no chance for political trickery. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey has certainly had enough experience with colleges and universities to know the amount of politics among the faculties of such institutions. I have been told by college professors that tangling with the State legislature was child's play compared to getting into a faculty meeting.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, we have heard all these suggestions before.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from West Virginia who would decide whether or not a project was acceptable.

Mr. KILGORE. The Foundation itself.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then what is the need for this amendment? If it is an acceptable project the Foundation, if it is performing its duty—and we assume that it will be composed of reliable, zealous individuals—would be bound in all moral conscience to give them the money anyway, without this amendment, if the project were acceptable. Under the general provisions of the bill, if the Foundation says that it will not grant the money to an institution because the project is unacceptable, it would say the same thing, if it were composed of honest men, under the terms of the Senator's amendment; and either 25 percent of the funds would be frozen or the institutions would say, "We must dig up a project, because there is some money waiting for us in Washington. Let us dig up a plausible project so that we can get the money."

Mr. KILGORE. That may be the theory of the Senator from Iowa. We talk about the Foundation's money. It is the people's money. We talk about making inventions. What is to happen when the scientists who make the inventions grow old and die? Dr. Jewett stated that no scientist was worth anything for original work in basic science after he reached the age of 35.

What I am trying to do is to make sure that there will be no forgotten States, and that they will at least have the opportunity to submit projects which fit the various States, and which may be in line with the general program.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I approach the action on this bill with the utmost confidence that this will be a completely reliable group of superior-minded individuals and superior-intentioned persons of distinction. I believe that they will have at heart the development of science in all its phases.

From listening to the debate, with some memory of what has happened in the past, I believe that this amendment would do a disservice to the people in the expenditure of their own money. The Foundation will dispense the money, whether it is the people's money or not. The practical result of the amendment would be to earmark 25 percent, which would not be subject to the superior judgment, examination, intelligence, and discretion of the members of the Foundation.

I hope to be able to have confidence enough in the Foundation to assume that if any institution has a sound, feasible, and practicable project that will contribute to the advancement of science, the Foundation will immediately give it such aid as it can. If the Foundation adopts any other attitude, then the very basis of the Foundation itself will crumble. I believe that to earmark 25 percent of the money and make it mandatory that it be scattered broadcast on projects upon which the Foundation would pass in either event, would represent the isolation and sterilization of a substantial portion of this money, so that it could not be used with versatility by the Foundation. To that extent the freedom of science and the freedom of projects would be curtailed.

Mr. KILGORE. What does the Senator mean by "scattered broadcast"?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Several Senators have asked me as to when a vote on this amendment may be expected. Senators are compelled to be absent from the Chamber in attendance upon committee meetings, and I wonder if we could not arrive at a decision as to whether or not we wish to vote on this amendment this evening, or whether we can obtain unanimous consent to vote on it sometime tomorrow, so that Senators who are present may be able to attend to other duties.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I was about to yield the floor. Would it be

agreeable to the Senator from West Virginia, unless some other Senator wishes to speak, to vote immediately on this amendment? Then if there is another amendment with which we can deal tonight, well and good. If not, I should like to think in terms of some sort of unanimous-consent agreement to vote on all amendments tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if it would be agreeable to vote on this amendment at 1 o'clock tomorrow, and upon all other amendments to the bill at 3 o'clock, with an appropriate division of the time. Is that a reasonable suggestion?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. We do not know what amendments are to be offered. So far as the two amendments in which I am interested are concerned, I could get along under such an arrangement. I understand that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has an amendment. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has an amendment. Several other Senators may have amendments. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that I got myself into a rather embarrassing situation yesterday, and I do not wish to speak for any of my colleagues today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Could we vote on this amendment at 1 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. KILGORE. I am willing to vote upon this amendment at 1 o'clock tomorrow, or at 12:30. I do not know whether the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has anything to say about it. I do not know whether the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] wishes to discuss the amendment further.

Mr. SMITH. Would the Senator be willing to accept a limitation of half an hour's debate on any amendment which may be offered? Some amendments may be offered which may require a little more time.

Mr. KILGORE. I am willing to limit myself to 12 minutes, although I should like to have a little more time on the two amendments in which I am interested.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would it be agreeable to the Senator to vote at 12:30?

Mr. KILGORE. I am willing to vote on the pending amendment at 12:30.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote tomorrow at 12:30 p. m. on the pending amendment and all amendments to the pending amendment, and that the time be divided equally between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Ohio a question? Does he refer only to the amendments to the pending amendment?

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. At that time it is my hope that we may agree on a time to vote on some of the other amendments. I should like to have them settled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the Senator from Ohio will withhold his request long enough to permit me to submit two amendments at this time?

Mr. TAFT. Are they amendments to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; they are amendments to the bill.

Mr. TAFT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement relates only to the pending amendment, and amendments to the pending amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am submitting an amendment in two alternate forms. I should like to have the amendment considered.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to withhold the request so that the Senator from Iowa may submit his amendments.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I submit two amendments intended to be proposed by me to the pending bill, and ask that they lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in response to the requests of several Senators I now modify my request to make the time 1 o'clock instead of 12:30.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, the request is to vote at 1 o'clock tomorrow on the pending amendment and all amendments to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio, as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I hope very much that we can finish the bill tomorrow. While there may be more amendments, I think there is only one which will provoke much debate.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH. I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. HILL. With reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] regarding the appointment of the Director of the Foundation—

Mr. SMITH. I should like to make an extended statement with reference to it when it is presented. There is a difference of opinion about it, and I want to make the issue perfectly clear. So far as I am personally concerned, it would be agreeable to me, but some of my colleagues do not agree regarding it.

Mr. HILL. It may be the best that can be worked out at this time, and I am mindful of the fact that the bill will have to be acted on by the House committee, passed by the House, and most

probably will go to a conference committee.

Mr. SMITH. Do I correctly understand, then, that the Senator from Alabama would rather not have the amendment adopted and would prefer to leave the bill as it is?

Mr. HILL. I prefer the amendment to the bill as it is, but I do not think the amendment is a very good compromise.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington a question with reference to this amendment, if I may. In the first place, I am opposed to the amendment and agree with what the Senator from New Jersey has said and what the Senator from Iowa has said. The purpose of the bill, as I understand it, is to get the most benefit we can from a comparatively small amount of money.

It seems to me that the amendment is erroneously drawn, for these reasons: First, on page 2, in lines 1 and 2, it states that one-fourth shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, and then there is a comma. If \$20,000,000 is appropriated, 25 percent of that is \$5,000,000, and one-fourth of 25 percent is \$1,250,000, which means that \$24,000 will go to each of the 48 States and must be apportioned among them. As I read it, it does not specify how the money shall be used. The remainder of the paragraph discusses contracts and financial arrangements satisfactory to the Foundation. But the first quarter which will have to go to each one of the States goes to it, or is held for it, regardless of any financial or contractual arrangement with the Foundation.

I should like to call the attention of the Senator to another mistake, as I see it. In line 21 reference is made to advice received by the Board. I imagine the amendment was drafted to apply to the bill of last year. So far as I know, there is no board, and there could be no advice received from any board.

I personally hope that the amendment will not be agreed to, for the reasons already stated. If it is to be agreed to, it seems to me it should be revamped.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. The language has been lifted from last year's bill, and the word "Foundation" should be substituted for the word "Board."

With reference to the one-fourth which shall be apportioned among the States in equal shares, that is also subject to the Foundation's approval of a plan which fits in with its other plans.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think it clearly so provides.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It should. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. HOEY. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey if he would consider an amendment in line 18 on the second page of the bill, by adding the words "Association of American Universities", so that that association would be on the list of those who would be permitted to recommend nominations to the President. A great many educators and scientists have been insistent that the Association of American Universities should be specifically recognized.

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to have the suggestion of the distinguished Senator. I think it is relevant, and I think that change could be made. It was not originally intended to omit it. We brought in the land-grant colleges and universities when we were discussing the type of distribution, and we thought we would protect them by including them in the list.

Mr. HOEY. I offer, then, an amendment to include in line 18 on page 2 of the bill, after the universities named, the words "Association of American Universities."

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. I offer the amendment, and the Senator from New Jersey has accepted it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is to the bill itself. Is there objection to its consideration at this time? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. In view of the certainty that this matter cannot be disposed of tonight, and in view, also, of the unanimous-consent agreement already entered into, I wondered if the Senator desired to continue longer this evening.

Mr. SMITH. No. I should be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me for a closing question. I have an amendment which is thoroughly satisfactory to all the sponsors of the bill. I have submitted it to all of them. It refers to a protection against the invasion of the atomic-energy field by the Foundation without the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission. I do not think there will be any debate on it, because the sponsors of the amendment have all said that it was perfectly satisfactory. I should not want to propose an amendment with only a small attendance in the Senate unless the sponsors of the measure feel that it is perfectly proper so to do. I think we may as well get it out of the way, unless there is some objection.

Mr. SMITH. I will say in that connection that the only question I raised to the distinguished Senator from Iowa was that, naturally, I do not want to see anything done in the way of basic research which will fall to protect the Government in the atomic-energy field under the terms of the Atomic Energy Act. Of course I assume that research in this field will be subject to the control of the Atomic Energy Commission. I have no objection to an amendment which will protect the security of the country, and, at the same time, which will not be so

stringent as not to permit the fullest experimentation in these various fields.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield, I will say that I talked to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] about 10 minutes ago on the floor and submitted to him this amendment, which I think is a milder form of amendment than the one I originally submitted to him, and he agreed to it.

I also submitted it to the other sponsors of the bill.

At the end of section 15 of the bill I propose to add a properly designated paragraph, as follows:

The Foundation shall not support any research or development activity in the field of atomic energy without first having obtained the concurrence of the Atomic Energy Commission that such activity will not adversely affect the common defense and security. Nothing in this act shall supersede or modify any provision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

That is one of the two alternative amendments which I have sent to the desk to have printed. It is the one I prefer, and I think it is probably the better of the two. It would be the one that I would offer tomorrow. As I have said, if there is objection to having it considered tonight, I shall wait until tomorrow to have it considered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I am in entire accord with the spirit of the amendment. It relates to a very important matter, and I have discussed it quite extensively with various persons who are interested in the subject. I should think it would be wiser to present it tomorrow, when more Senators are present, and I should prefer to have it presented tomorrow, although of course I do not attempt to interfere in any way with what the Senator seeks to accomplish.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I prefer not to call up the amendment at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any particular reason why the cancer amendment should not be considered and adopted at this time?

Mr. SMITH. No; so far as I am concerned, I should be happy to have it adopted now.

Mr. TAFT. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate consider the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and myself. I understand that the amendment is entirely satisfactory to the authors of the bill.

Mr. SMITH. It is entirely satisfactory. I have questioned all the authors of the bill about it, and all of them have agreed to this very important amendment relating to the field of cancer research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none; and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, for himself, the Senator from Florida, and the Senator from Washington will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 19, after the word "authorized", it is proposed to insert the words "and directed";

On page 4, line 15, to strike out the word "and";

On page 4, line 18, to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

On page 4, between lines 18 and 19, to insert the following:

(7) To establish (a) a special commission on cancer research, (b) a special commission on heart and intravascular diseases, and (c) such other special commissions as the Foundation may from time to time deem necessary. Each commission shall consist of 11 members, 6 of whom shall be eminent scientists, expert in the field of medicine or the basic sciences, and 5 of whom shall represent the public, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and to serve at the pleasure of the President. It shall be the duty of each special commission created under the authority of this subsection to make a full and adequate survey of research both public and private being carried on in its field, and to formulate and recommend to the National Science Foundation an over-all research program in its field, and constantly to review the manner in which such programs are being carried out.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have just received a telegram from the president of the American Cancer Society, suggesting that the commissions referred to in the amendment be set up in such a way that the terms of office of three of the members expire in one year, and the terms of four expire in the following year, and the terms of the last four expire in the third year. I do not know whether the Senator from Ohio would like to include in the amendment appropriate language for such a provision.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it wise to include such language. The amendment covers various kinds of commissions, and they may be of different sizes and characteristics. I should think we could leave that matter to the Executive Committee and the Foundation.

Mr. SMITH. I agree with the Senator from Ohio. I have read the telegram simply because I have received it from Mr. Adams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, for himself and other Senators.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will I have the floor when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow? I should like to have the floor at that time, so as to continue with the consideration of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from New Jersey will be entitled to the floor when the Senate meets tomorrow.

TOWN AND COUNTRY—EDITORIAL BY ALFRED D. STEDMAN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, considerable circulation has been given recently to statements and comments which tend to separate the various segments of our economic life and various groups of our people. I have been especially disturbed over what appears to me to be a

recurrence of differences between farm and city people. Statements are made that a reason for the high cost of living is the fact that the Government has maintained a price support under basic agricultural commodities. Farm people have been accused of profiting under Federal subsidy. Our rural areas and their people have been indirectly attacked by those who oppose such programs as rural electrification and soil conservation.

Many of those statements and accusations, as we well know, are based on misinformation and distortion. The differences they create are most unfortunate. It was with considerable satisfaction, therefore, that I read an editorial, entitled "Town and Country," which Mr. Alfred D. Stedman wrote for the St. Paul Pioneer Press of Sunday, May 11. It is so true and so constructive in spirit, that I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TOWN AND COUNTRY

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

A way now is found to clear up misunderstandings between city and country.

That way has been shown in recent days by the University of Minnesota College of Agriculture, in conducting the rural church institute. In that institute, ministers of different denominations explored with faculty and research men the social, religious, and economic problems of town and country. The work with this group can be done also with other groups.

Thus the basis is laid for a very broad function for the college. That is service as a meeting point and information center for groups wanting light on country-city problems. The college's emergence in this role justifies by performance the Minnesota Legislature's recent remarkable vote of confidence in it.

For today, a very special need exists for enlightenment and tolerance as between farmers and city people. The reason is the current barrage of publicity tending to stir up misunderstandings, if not ill will, between them.

One sample of that barrage is J. B. Griswold's featured article in the May issue of the American magazine finding that American farmers are the most pampered people in the world. That conclusion he supports in part by charging up to farm aid all costs of all Government departments of agriculture for everything, including many services to the general public, and in part by a gross error lumping half a billion dollars of consumer subsidies spent to keep food prices down under the general head of Government spending to keep farm prices up.

Another sample is Life magazine's full-page blast on May 5, which singles out as its target this country's governmental umbrella over the poorer 3,800,000 of the Nation's 5,800,000 farm families. If the inefficient farmer chooses peasantry, let him have it, is Life's view.

Other appeals to city people to support the slashing of Government aids to farmers are frequent.

But what about the facts bearing upon the questions thus being raised? The rural church institute uncovered a great storehouse of authentic information. It performed a real service by calling attention to the progress of human knowledge in this field.

Are farmers really our most pampered people?

As to income, the Government's official postwar hope is that they may average half as much individual income per year as other people. As to living, almost half the farm homes in the country and nearly 9 out of 10 in the Dakotas still lack electricity and the conveniences, sanitation, and everything else going with it. As to working, farm hours of labor are 30 to 100 percent greater than city working hours. As to health, farmers have more sickness, worse teeth, more accidents, fewer doctors, fewer nurses, fewer hospitals, and higher death rates among fathers, mothers, and children than city people have. As to education, farm people have worse schools, poorer teachers, and more illiteracy than city people. As to security, farmers and farm labor are the only group left out of the social-security system. As to churches, the struggles against poverty, debt, low pay of pastors, and multiplicity of churches are worse than such struggles of city churches.

Of course, all this doesn't discount the opportunity for the selective type of Government economies that would thin out ineffective helpers of agriculture, get rid of deadwood in Government personnel, eliminate the overlap in governmental farm agencies, and still not cripple any real service.

But it does definitely dispose of the charge that this country's farming people are pampered in any ordinary sense of that term.

The true story of the relation between city and country people deserves to be mutually understood.

The fact is that American cities depend on the farms for their very populations. Those that, like St. Paul, are growing, derive part of that growth from people drawn in from the farm. Others whose growth has leveled off must depend on an influx from outside to keep their present size. These would shrink if they had to depend for replacements on their own birth rates alone.

So the cities must look to the farms for their people. In Minnesota, of 9,000 farm boys and girls reaching 18 years of age each year, one-third move to town. Nationally, the farms are the real mothers of the cities.

And for renewal of population, the cities must turn specifically to the low-income farm group. For the birth rate among the higher-income farmers is itself falling. It's the poor who have the most daughters and sons to send to town. And more and more, the poor white and poor black farm population of Southeastern United States is becoming the human reservoir of this Nation's cities.

It's not intelligent to draw a line between city and country, and to let bad health, illiteracy, bad morals, and poverty spread on the farm side of that line. For such infections are sure to be carried cityward, thus increasing the cities' already great financial burdens of combating those ills within the city limits.

So it is demonstrated that the great problems of farm and city are truly mutual. And the Minnesota College of Agriculture in the rural church institute has served as a meeting place for effective mutual work on those problems. The pattern is adaptable to later discussions that could include representation of business, labor, professional, and other groups. Plans for a town and country conference already are being talked about.

Thus the foundation is laid for a work of continuing usefulness for the college. Better understanding between country and city can be the goal. The college has shown how it can serve as a center of group efforts to that end.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

TREATIES OF PEACE WITH ITALY, RUMANIA, BULGARIA, AND HUNGARY (EX. REPT. NO. 4)

As in executive session.

Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submitted a report to accompany the treaties of peace with Italy, Executive F; Rumania, Executive G; Bulgaria, Executive H; and Hungary, Executive I, heretofore reported by that committee, which was ordered to be printed.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 16, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George J. Schoeneman, of Newport, R. I., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Harold R. Medina, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. Samuel Mandelbaum, deceased.

Albert V. Bryan, of Virginia, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, vice Hon. Robert N. Pollard, retired.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Roy S. Nunnally to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947.

The following-named midshipmen to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of appointment as ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated:

James R. Ahern	Thomas F. Murphy, Jr.
Bruce A. Benson	Gordon W. Phelps, Jr.
William D. Crawford	William J. Reynders
Gail L. Heasley	Joseph E. Spalding
Sheldon L. Hirsch	Gerald H. Weyrauch
Martin D. Marder	Harry I. Zankman

The following-named to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947:

George R. Lathan
Nell E. Nelson, Jr.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of appointment as assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated:

William E. Ainslie	Harold A. McCauley
Robert M. Bonk	Thomas O. Nutt, Jr.
Duane D. Borgert	Edward A. Short
Raymond E. Jeffery	Samuel S. Stephens
John R. Logan	

The following-named to be ensigns in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu

of appointment as assistant civil engineers in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated:

Joseph W. Neudecker, Jr.
James L. Yates

The following-named to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947, in lieu of appointment as ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated:

William Blanchard, Jr.
Frank G. Simala

The following-named to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign:

Robert R. Poitras
Donald B. Small

The following-named to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade):

"W" "J" Blevins	Bernard J. Isabella
Richard L. Divoll	John A. Mitchell
David LaM. Flynn	Herbert F. Zinsmeister,
Robert H. Hartley	Jr.

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANT

*Raubert, Louis J.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Belcher, Preston R.
*Castro, Luis V.

ENSIGNS

Ackiss, James H.	Kedigh, Percy E.
Alley, Justus N.	Kimener, Robert A.
Applegate, Richard C.	Konrady, John A.
Bailiff, John W.	Loftis, Raymond M.
Barckmann, Walter H.	Mapes, George C.
Barley, Cecil E.	Martini, Livio
Bernstein, Fred J.	Mawhiney, William T.
Best, Charles L., Jr.	McCracken, William H.
Boston, Leadore G.	McDonald, John S.
Bragg, Frank B.	Millar, Robert W.
Brennan, William F.	Nelson, Gerard L.
Briggs, Winston D.	O'Rourke, Gerard A.
Bryant, Harold V.	Plath, Carl W.
Chapman, Kendall J.	Reese, Clyde V., Jr.
Claudius, Robert H.	*Rice, Charles E.
Coe, Arthur S.	Saine, James E.
Conley, Richard D.	Scoggins, Willis L., Jr.
Coonrod, Edgar E.	Setzer, Brooks W., Jr.
Cuniff, Roger L.	*Sharratt, George S.
Enrikkin, Joseph W.	H., Jr.
Everett, William H.	*Smith, Emory C.
Fischer, Richard H.	Smith, Newel W., Jr.
Franeck, Rainold J.	Spoon, Donald D.
Gentry, Harold R.	Steer, George L.
Glessner, LeRoy H.	Valencia, Eugene A.
*Greenberg, Mack K.	Vaught, Thomas B.
*Greene, William N.	Webb, Howard "T", Jr.
Guedel, Kenneth C.	Wells, John T.
Harbaugh, James A.	Williams, Nathaniel T.,
Hawkins, Carl R.	Jr.
Husty, Richard M.	Windsor, Clayton C.
Irvine, Harry B.	

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Flannery, John L.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Berry, Reginald V.	Marr, James C., Jr.
Campbell, John C. W.	Marra, John J.
Delaney, Henry R.	Naman, Marvin J.
Horr, Edward A.	Stovall, William D., Jr.
Mallams, John T.	Taber, Thomas H., Jr.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Baumgartner, Donald F.	Holt, Robert O.
Bell, Adrian D.	Kramp, Henry F.
Boltwood, Chester M.	MacLeod, Murdock R.
Craven, Ethridge	Pavlick, Marvin S.
Deem, Ralph E.	Peck, William G.
	Walsh, Robert G.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Dwyer, William D.	Loomer, Gwenn M.
Gray, Gus W.	McGrath, Noel G.
Hill, David A.	Miller, John W.
Kennedy, Loren S.	Newman, Dwight W.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF GUNNER

Nikkonen, Rudolph

CHIEF TORPEDOMEN

Andrews, David "J"
Collier, Charles L.

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

Barnes, Arthur W.
Jackson, Harry W.

CHIEF MACHINISTS

Allbritton, Alton S.
Hearst, Ray
Yates, Henry S.

CHIEF PHOTOGRAPHER

Olson, Lloyd A.

CHIEF PHARMACIST

Conoway, Theodore H.

The following-named officers to the rank and grades indicated to correct spelling of name as previously nominated and confirmed:

ENSIGN

Setzer, Lester E. G.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Leiser, Harry W.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 15, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the living God and the God of the living, Thy immortal word is with us: Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me bless His holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits. He hath not dealt with us after our sins, nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is His mercy toward them that fear Him. For He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust.

O Father, Thou who art ever present in the hidden life in which we live and move and have our being, be Thou in our thoughts unspoken, in our feelings unexpressed, and in the concealed conflicts in the soul. Whatever this day may reveal, we pray Thee to bless us with quietude of spirit and serenity of soul and lead us into the love of our

Father and the patience of our Master. In every crisis may we keep our anchorage to Thee unbroken.

In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 14, 1947:

H. R. 2157. An act to relieve employers from certain liabilities and punishments under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Bacon-Davis Act, and for other purposes.

On May 15, 1947:

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States Commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States Commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of belligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940; and

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

MAY 14, 1947.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby wish to inform the House that I have transmitted to the

Governor of Maryland my resignation as a Member of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress from the Third Congressional District of Maryland, effective May 16, 1947.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS D'ALESSANDRO, Jr.,

Member of Congress,

Third District, Maryland.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Sumner Welles.

THE ITALIAN SITUATION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, the situation in Italy is deteriorating at an alarming rate. And yet we appear unable to develop continuity and integration in our foreign policy. At a time when Italy requires a minimum of \$120,000,000 for relief for the balance of the year in order to stave off starvation and communism, this body reduced the amount in the relief bill by \$150,000,000. It is my fervent hope that the House will accept the decision of the other body to provide the full amount.

At a time when we have voted \$300,000,000 to resist Yugoslav despotism in Greece, the other body is contemplating the ratification of the Italian peace treaty which constitutes, in effect, assistance to Yugoslav despotism in Italy. Ominous portents of the rise of communism are implicit in the resignation of Premier De Gasperi. It is time that we demonstrate a vigorous consistency and forthright leadership in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in America, May 10, 1947, which contains an interview between Mr. Henry L. Nunn, a Milwaukee industrial leader, and attorney David Keyser.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Ansel E. Talbert concerning the 16-pound \$130 radar which protects the commercial air liner, about which there has been so much discussion regarding air safety.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New Orleans Item.

AVIATION

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee of the Whole arose late yesterday afternoon, it had under consideration a substitute amendment which I offered to provide funds to the Civil Aeronautics Administration with which to operate air traffic control towers throughout the country. This morning's Washington Post, in a news article, stated that the particular airport for which funds had been added in this substitute amendment was in my district. I wish to correct that impression. That other airport is not in my district.

I should like to take this opportunity to reiterate what I stated yesterday that, by any parliamentary device conceivable, I will be very happy and anxious to include funds in my substitute amendment that would include any airport which had been authorized and approved by the CAA subsequent to the time the CAA submitted its proposed estimate to the Committee on Appropriations.

In this regard may I also state that I think my substitute amendment is most comprehensive in that it is up to date, including an airport which has so recently been approved, and it makes affirmative provision that these funds shall be used for this purpose. I think it tends toward uniformity and is indispensable to the safety and uniformity of our air traffic throughout the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

AID TO ITALY AND GERMANY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] proceeds to tell us that Italy is going to collapse unless we pour American money into that disturbed area. You will find an article in today's Wall Street Journal to the effect that the rest of the world will virtually depend upon the United States for their livelihood during the coming year.

It says that "in 1947 the world by its own labors will pay for only 14 percent of what it obtains from the United States."

What is to keep those Italians from making their own living?

Why not let them go to work and produce food for the Italian people?

We should pursue a similar course in Germany.

For my part, I would like to see us make a separate peace with Germany along with such other non-Communist allies as care to join us.

Our present conduct in Germany is a disgrace. The best thing we could do would be to get those Negro troops out of there and stop the perpetration of crimes against the helpless white women of Germany that would shock the modesty of the savages of the jungles.

The next best thing we should do would be to send some real Americans, some white gentiles, if we are going to send anybody to Germany, stop harassing the German people and let them go to making their own living.

If the Italian people are not willing to work and make their own living out of Italian soil, certainly the people of America, who are now struggling to make their own living, cannot keep them up indefinitely. I say it is about time we clean house in the State Department and every other department of this Government and get back to the old fundamental American principles advocated by Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Benjamin Franklin and start to restoring the peace of the world—regardless of Communist opposition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain excerpts.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report of the resolutions committee of the Jewish World War Veterans.

BRING UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION ACT UP TO DATE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on a bill I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there are some people who assume that if a person is employed by the United States Government he does not labor. Yet to take one Government agency as an example, in this case the Post Office Department, we find that every individual and every business in the country depends upon its services. The billions of letters and parcels that are collected, transported, and delivered to thousands of communities in the United States during the course of a year, is a task of mammoth proportions, and is work in the real sense of the word.

However, these and all other Government employees are denied the rights enjoyed by workers who are organized in private employment to improve their standards. They cannot strike. The only recourse they have is to appeal to the Congress to correct inequalities as they arise. Sometimes the merits of their case get as far as committee hearings and no further.

The provisions of the United States Employees' Compensation Act offer stark proof of the way in which our trusted Government workers are neglected.

This act was originally passed on September 7, 1916.

With minor exceptions, it has remained unchanged for 31 years, during the most changeful period in American history. Hours, wages, working conditions, prices, and the whole economic pattern of American life has become

more complex and interdependent, so that adjustments are frequently needed to keep the system in balance. The depressed condition of labor has changed for the better. Even the textile workers of my district, for years one of the most underpaid groups in the Nation, are coming into their own. Organized they have won decent pay, safer working conditions, unemployment security, old-age security, sickness and accident insurance, and many other benefits.

Government employees have also shared in some of these gains. The one shocking oversight is in the matter of compensation paid for injuries suffered while in the performance of duty.

A Government worker is not an abstraction. He is a human being and is entitled to the same consideration and protection as other workers. Day in and day out, Government workers perform tasks which too often are taken for granted. In the course of their employment, they too, meet up with certain hazards.

If they are injured, or fall sick, they suffer more than many other groups of workers by the lengthening gap between the small, fixed compensation they receive and the soaring prices they must pay for the bare necessities of life. To call this situation unjust, is a mocking understatement. Government employees are worried. How can they possibly make both ends meet under deflated compensation rates, and inflated prices, if they become disabled at their work? For the answer to this haunting question, they turn to the Congress seeking an equitable adjustment.

The present ceiling on which compensation rates are based is a salary of \$2,100 a year. In the last few years, Federal employees have received raises which, for many of them, put their earnings above this figure. One who was earning \$2,100 before the general pay increases is now earning \$2,770.20.

The old monthly maximum and monthly minimum rates for compensation should be computed against the higher ceiling of \$2,770.20.

I am introducing a bill to provide for this upward adjustment.

Under its terms, section 6 of the act of September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended—United States Code, 1940 edition, title 5, section 756—is amended by striking out "\$116.66", wherever such sum appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "\$153.90" and by striking out "\$58.33", wherever such sum appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "\$76.95."

The original pay increases were granted to help Government employees keep up with the increased cost of living, which, discounting the inevitable drop in prices, will never go down to prewar levels.

Compensation for injuries incurred while working for the Government must also keep step with present-day realities.

This legislation has been long overdue. Government workers are looking to this session of Congress for its speedy enactment.

ANOTHER BRITISH LOAN? NOT WITH MY VOTE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there is evidently a great deal of propaganda being spilled into this country by the British Information Service, the British Embassy, and other British agencies to whoop up enthusiasm for another British loan—the third British loan.

This money is being asked to support British socialism at home and imperialism abroad. Great Britain is suffering the pains of Empire. She is now paying the penalty for her Empire sins, like the Amritsar massacres, the Black and Tan murders, and Dov Gruner executions. The chickens of her policy of divide and conquer are coming home to roost. For all of this she has the audacity again to ask our help.

Under the second loan agreement, she promised to dissolve the sterling area bloc pool by July 18. She must default on this promise. She owes over \$14,000,000,000 to India, Egypt, Brazil, South Africa, Iraq, Palestine, and so forth. All these countries have refused to scale down her debt. She cannot pay the dollars she owes them. Hence she will default in her promise to dissolve the pool. She deliberately violated the loan agreement when she signed her trade pact with Argentina, whereby she demanded that Argentina purchase her future goods within the sterling area.

She refuses to do away with imperial preference, which is a studied discrimination against our goods in all her far-flung dominions.

With our dollars she supports needlessly over a million men in arms. She said she could not afford to keep 14,000 troops in Greece, but she maintains over 100,000 troops in Palestine. These troops support a police state there and keep the country and its inhabitants in a state of fear and terror.

She will now ask another loan to bail out, to support that police state in Palestine and her Empire dominions in various parts of Africa and Asia.

The British Empire is sick and decadent and dollars will not save her.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 938, to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President may from time to time when he deems it in the interest of the United States furnish assistance to Greece and Turkey, upon request of their governments, and upon terms and conditions determined by him—

"(1) by rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise, to those countries;

"(2) by detailing to assist those countries any persons in the employ of the Government of the United States; and the provisions of the Act of May 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 442), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such Act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph: *Provided, however*, That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel have been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

"(3) by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only; and the provisions of the Act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended, applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to such act, as amended, shall be applicable to personnel detailed pursuant to this paragraph;

"(4) by providing for (A) the transfer to, and the procurement for by manufacture or otherwise and the transfer to, those countries of any articles, services, and information, and (B) the instruction and training of personnel of those countries; and

"(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 2. (a) Sums from advances by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) and from the appropriations made under authority of section 4 (b) may be allocated for any of the purposes of this Act to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government. Any amount so allocated shall be available as advancement or reimbursement, and shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, to appropriate appropriations, funds or accounts existing or established for the purpose.

"(b) Whenever the President requires payment in advance by the Government of Greece or of Turkey for assistance to be furnished to such countries in accordance with this Act, such payments when made shall be credited to such countries in accounts established for the purpose. Sums from such accounts shall be allocated to the departments, agencies, or independent establishments of the Government which furnish the assistance for which payment is received, in the same manner, and shall be available and credited in the same manner, as allocations made under subsection (a) of this section. Any portion of such allocation not used as reimbursement shall remain available until expended.

"(c) Whenever any portion of an allocation under subsection (a) or subsection (b) is used as reimbursement, the amount of reimbursement shall be available for entering into contracts and other uses during the

fiscal year in which the reimbursement is received and the ensuing fiscal year. Where the head of any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government determines that replacement of any article transferred pursuant to paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"(d) (1) Payment in advance by the Government of Greece or of Turkey shall be required by the President for any articles or services furnished to such country under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 if they are not paid for from funds advanced by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under section 4 (a) or from funds appropriated under authority of section 4 (b).

"(2) No department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government shall furnish any articles or services under paragraph (4) (A) of section 1 to either Greece or Turkey, unless it receives advancements or reimbursements therefor out of allocations under subsection (a) or (b) of this section.

"SEC. 3. As a condition precedent to the receipt of any assistance pursuant to this Act, the government requesting such assistance shall agree (a) to permit free access of United States Government officials for the purpose of observing whether such assistance is utilized effectively and in accordance with the undertakings of the recipient government; (b) to permit representatives of the press and radio of the United States to observe freely and to report fully regarding the utilization of such assistance; (c) not to transfer, without the consent of the President of the United States, title to or possession of any article or information transferred pursuant to this Act nor to permit, without such consent, the use of any such article or the use or disclosure of any such information by or to anyone not an officer, employee, or agent of the recipient government; (d) to make such provisions as may be required by the President of the United States for the security of any article, service, or information received pursuant to this Act; (e) not to use any part of the proceeds of any loan, credit, grant, or other form of aid rendered pursuant to this Act for the making of any payment on account of the principal or interest on any loan made to such government by any other foreign government; and (f) to give full and continuous publicity within such country as to the purpose, source, character, scope, amounts, and progress of United States economic assistance carried on therein pursuant to this Act.

"SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed, until such time as an appropriation shall be made pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, to make advances, not to exceed in the aggregate \$100,000,000, to carry out the provisions of this Act, in such manner and in such amounts as the President shall determine.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed \$400,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. From appropriations made under this authority there shall be repaid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the advances made by it under subsection (a) of this section.

"SEC. 5. The President may from time to time prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper to carry out any of the provisions of this Act; and he may exercise any power or authority conferred upon him pursuant to this Act through such department, agency, independent establishment, or officer of the Government as he shall direct.

"The President is directed to withdraw any or all aid authorized herein under any of the following circumstances:

"(1) If requested by the Government of Greece or Turkey, respectively, representing a majority of the people of either such nation;

"(2) If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable;

"(3) If the President finds that any purposes of the Act have been substantially accomplished by the action of any other intergovernmental organizations or finds that the purposes of the Act are incapable of satisfactory accomplishment; and

"(4) If the President finds that any of the assurances given pursuant to section 3 are not being carried out.

"SEC. 6. Assistance to any country under this Act may, unless sooner terminated by the President, be terminated by concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress.

"SEC. 7. The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures and activities, which shall include uses of funds by the recipient governments, under authority of this Act.

"SEC. 8. The chief of any mission to any country receiving assistance under this Act shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of this Act as the President shall prescribe."

And the House agree to the same.

CHARLES A. EATON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
SOL BLOOM,
JOHN KEE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

A. H. VANDENBERG,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is in the form of a substitute for both the text of the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

The bill agreed to in conference is for the most part the same as the bill passed by the House. Except for minor technical and clerical differences, the differences between the House amendment and the conference argument are noted below.

The House amendment contained a provision that no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of the act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The conference agreement provides that no such assignment shall be made until such personnel have been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The House amendment contained in substance the provision known as the Vandenberg amendment. As passed by the House, the second paragraph of this amendment was not identical with the paragraph as passed by the Senate. The conference agreement includes the language finally adopted

by the Senate. The provision requires the President to withdraw aid if the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of any veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable.

The bill as passed by the Senate contained a provision requiring that the chief of any mission to any country receiving assistance shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall perform such functions relating to the administration of the act as the President shall prescribe. There was no corresponding provision in the House amendment. The conference agreement includes this provision.

CHARLES A. EATON,
KARL E. MUNDT,
BARTEL J. JONKMAN,
SOL BLOOM,
JOHN KEE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Auchincloss	Evins	Mansfield, Tex.
Barden	Fellows	Meyer
Bates, Ky.	Flannagan	Miller, Nebr.
Bender	Forand	Mitchell
Bennett, Mich.	Fuller	Morrison
Bland	Gavin	Patman
Blatnik	Gearhart	Pfeiffer
Buckley	Gifford	Phillips, Tenn.
Buffett	Gregory	Powell
Bulwinkle	Hall	Rayfield
Butler	Edwin Arthur	Sarbacher
Byrne, N. Y.	Hartley	Scoblick
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Clements	Jennings	Somers
Clippinger	Kearns	Sundstrom
D'Alesandro	Keogh	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Devitt	Lesinski	Vinson
Dingell	McDowell	Vursell
Dondero	Macy	West

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 369 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3311, with Mr. CURTIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to line 5 on page 46. There was then pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many Members of the House have come to see me this morning and asked me to explain what this amendment does and whether or not it has anything to do with another item in a subsequent page of the bill having to do with Federal airports.

This amendment seeks to restore \$4,849,000 on page 45 under the heading of "Civil Aeronautics Administration", line 18, reading "other agencies serving aviation: \$66,133,000." The amendment seeks to increase that by \$4,849,000 and would restore 130 air-control towers in 130 locations plus 19 others in 19 locations over the country. You will find an explanation of that on page 797 of the hearings for the Department of Commerce. The hearings are available at the desk.

This has to do with the operation of the control towers only. It has to do with the restoration of the salaries paid to the operators in those 130 towns, plus 19 towns. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Federal-State airport program, the 7-year program, which we implemented with \$45,000,000 last year. We will come to that portion of the bill later on. This has absolutely nothing to do with the Federal airport program—merely with the operation of the control towers.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. GARY. On yesterday my colleague from New York [Mr. ROONEY] read a long list of names of cities that would be affected by the construction program. This particular item has nothing to do with those cities or the airports in those localities whatever. That deals entirely with the construction program, rather than with the operation program.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I want to further explain that the names of the towns to which this amendment applies are found on page 797, plus the names of the additional 19 towns that have been added.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I say that on page 5195 of the RECORD of May 13 will be found a list of the 148 cities which would be affected by the action of the committee in denying funds for the operation of these towers.

Mr. STEFAN. It has nothing to do with any other cities except the operation of the towers in those cities on the pages I mentioned.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman is speaking with reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. A substitute was offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL], and includes at least one city at the present time that has been approved, but approved too late to be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for consideration.

Mr. STEFAN. Your town would also be included in that category, would it not?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. My town is included.

Mr. STEFAN. Your town is paying for its own operations. There are many other towns paying for their own and are satisfied with that. If they cannot get it they do not want others to have it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Is the gentleman going to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly not.

Mr. RIVERS. I think you would be wise to accept it, because we are going to win anyway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If it is the policy of the Government to subsidize control towers at the various airports, why should they not subsidize the railroad signal tower down here at Union Station?

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. The gentleman has no airport in his district?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes, I have; plenty of them.

Mr. RIVERS. In other words, if you cannot have it, you do not want us to have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment. I do so because I think failure to adopt this amendment would strike a staggering blow at air safety in the United States.

Before I forget the question that was just asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] with reference to railroad signal stops, I should like to ask the same very distinguished gentleman if he favors turning back to local operation and local responsibility the navigation locks on all of the navigable streams in the inland-waterway system. I do not believe any such proposal will be made. I am certain the Congress would not give serious consideration to such proposal if it were made, because it has long been recognized that on the inland-waterway system it is a Federal responsibility to operate those navigation locks.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Inasmuch as the gentleman raised the question, I will say

that I am positively opposed to the Government's subsidizing inland waterways. I think the users of the inland waterways should pay for their operation.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield briefly, but then I should like to proceed to give a brief summary of the situation, if I may.

Mr. BONNER. With regard to the operation of the inland waterways system, the Federal Government recognizes the responsibility of safety at sea. We maintain the Coast Guard, light-house stations, and airplanes to provide safety at sea. It is just as necessary that the Government provide these aids for safety in the air as it is that they provide aids for safety in navigation at sea. It all has but one purpose, the preservation of life.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman, and I believe the situations are similar, and that regardless of all other arguments, the big question presented here is that of the safety of our airways and the protection of human lives.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just briefly to review this situation. A year ago the committee recommended the elimination of funds for the maintenance of air traffic control towers. At that time I offered an amendment to restore approximately \$3,000,000 to the appropriation bill for this operation. That amendment was adopted and the amount was restored for another year. The control towers were operated by CAA personnel from funds furnished by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that air traffic control towers are the very heart of the Federal-airways system. I believe no one who has made a careful study of the situation will hold any different opinion.

I believe that failure to provide for Federal operation of these control towers would be a very tragic action on the part of the Congress of the United States.

The proposal here is to turn these traffic control towers back to the operation of the municipalities across the country. That is the proposal. In other words, at the beginning of a new fiscal year, and without previous notice whatsoever, at a time when the officials of most of the municipalities have already made their budgets, the Congress says: "You must assume this additional responsibility beginning July 1." Such action will create utter chaos and confusion in the airways of the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. And coming at a time when city governments throughout the country are having serious fiscal problems of their own, this is a matter of national concern.

Mr. PRIEST. It is indeed a very, very serious problem of national concern, and I thank the gentleman for his very apt observation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I wish to concur in the views of the gentleman

from Tennessee and to ask this further question: Is it not true that these control tower employees are required to pass examinations and meet CAA standards of competency?

Mr. PRIEST. That is correct. And let me add one statement in that connection. In the report of the committee—and I do not say this with any desire or intention to be critical of the subcommittee or its distinguished chairman—the statement is made that these towers, in the opinion of the committee, should be operated by CAA trained personnel. That, however, is not the requirement of any law, and I do not see how we could say to a particular city in a particular State that it must employ certain persons who have not certain standards. I do not believe we can require that, under any existing law.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I have, along with the other distinguished members of that committee, given a great deal of time and attention to the whole question of air safety. Our committee, acting under direction of the House, has carried on a very extensive investigation of air accidents and safety since the first of the year.

As a result of that investigation and previous study of the subject, I feel very strongly that failure to provide funds for the operation of control towers will endanger the lives of thousands who fly our airways each day, and in effect would mark the beginning of the breaking up of our Federal airways system.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the committee has made a serious mistake in eliminating all appropriations for the employment of personnel who operate the airport-traffic-control towers now established throughout the Nation. The committee must realize that if these control towers are closed down, it will prove a real hazard to air travel, and it may well be assumed that air lines will detour all airports not providing control tower service. In this connection I want to make special reference to the situation as it presents itself at the Sioux City Municipal Airport in my congressional district. There have been over 8,000 aircraft movements, that is, landings and take-offs, on the Sioux City Airport during the month of April this year. The facilities of this airport are also used by the Iowa National Guard for training purposes. At the present time the Iowa National Guard has 35 planes stationed at this airport, 25 of which are P-51's. These planes travel at the rate of about 450 miles per hour and are often in the air at the same time as the smaller and slower planes are aloft. Anyone certainly can realize the great danger involved in such a situation without the use of a traffic-control tower. Surely these control towers are just as essential to safe navigation of the airways as lighthouses are to the safe navigation of the searoutes. The continued develop-

ment of aviation depends greatly on the element of the danger involved.

The elimination of this appropriation will also place on cities the responsibility for financing operations of the airport control towers in all municipalities except the city of Washington. Unless these cities are prepared to finance the operation of the towers by July 1, 1947, the effect may be a virtual paralysis of commercial air transportation. The committee report advocates that the full cost of operating these towers should be defrayed by the cities and municipalities in which the airports are located and who derive the benefit from the airports. In the first instance, the committee forgets that much of the traffic at these airports consists of Government aircraft who pay nothing for the service rendered by the control towers. There is nothing fair in such an arrangement.

The elimination of this appropriation will have serious repercussions in Iowa as far as needed finances are concerned for the operation of its control towers. In the first instance, budgets for cities and towns in Iowa are made in August of each year. Therefore, no funds were budgeted in August 1946 for the year 1947, and, consequently, no appropriations were made in 1947 for traffic-control-tower expense. No fees are collected from Federal, commercial, or private planes for control-tower service, and the city finances have been based upon the fact that the Federal Government was financing control-tower service, and as a result the cities have not attempted to recoup any sums of money from any person, firm, or corporation affording themselves of the control-tower service.

Control-tower expenses in a city is a definite hardship and adds to the burden which will ultimately destroy an efficient national system. For instance, the city of Des Moines, Iowa, has for many years had an annual deficit averaging \$18,000 on its airport. The Federal Government has occupied its hangar for \$1 per year during the war and is still hanging on to it. There is a like situation at the Sioux City Airbase. Here eight men are employed by the CAA to operate the control tower, and the cost of operation is \$32,821 annually. It is financially impossible for the city of Sioux City to make any budget arrangement whereby they can assume this load. In this connection, it should be said that the CAA has been contemplating the installation of an instrument approach system at the Sioux City Airbase to guide planes into the airport regardless of the weather. This is another development which the city could not afford to install, and as a result there will be further hazards in connection with all airport movements at the airport in case of bad weather.

I realize that the committee is insisting on economy in Government, and they are to be commended for attempting to do that very thing. However, there is such a thing as false economy, and it seems to me that the elimination of appropriations for the operation of air-traffic control towers is in that category. Certainly we cannot afford to increase the hazards in air traffic, and it

is my firm opinion that if the appropriation for the operation for these control towers is eliminated many cities in which the towers are located will simply discontinue the service because they do not have the money to carry on. I earnestly hope that the amendment is adopted.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can agree on some time. I wonder how many want to talk on this amendment. Certainly it is not the purpose of the committee to limit debate, and I certainly shall not move to cut debate because I want to be as liberal as I possibly can.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, we can agree on any time. I withdraw the request.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I cannot understand why the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to eliminate the funds needed for CAA financing and operating traffic-control towers at Billings, Helena, Lewistown, Butte, Great Falls, Missoula, and elsewhere in Montana. The risks to commercial and private flying would, if these funds are not restored, be too excessive and the public would pay for this false type of economy. The cost of maintaining control-tower operations are not the obligation of the cities concerned, but are of the Federal Government. The public safety is paramount and it is our obligation to protect it. The alternative to supplying the needed funds for these projects is to close them entirely or turn them over to the cities concerned. In the latter case the result will be to close them because the municipalities just have not got the finances needed to carry them on.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the House to vote for this amendment, and I insert with my remarks letters and telegrams received from Montana about this subject:

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 8, 1947.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative from Montana,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Have been advised that House Appropriations Committee has reduced funds requested for CAA grants to cities for airport projects by 50 percent. This reduction completely eliminates the city of Great Falls from participation in National Airport Act program. Wish to protest this action as city of Great Falls is financially unable to complete repairs of emergency nature which must be accomplished this summer.

HJALMER C. JOHNSON,
Mayor.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., May 8, 1947.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative from Montana,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Have been advised that House Appropriations Committee has eliminated funds for

CAA operations for airport-traffic control towers. Wish to protest this action as city of Great Falls would be unable financially to assume this burden.

HJALMER C. JOHNSON,
Mayor.

BILLINGS, MONT., May 11, 1947.

Representative MIKE MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Will you help cities get control-tower operation costs restored in Federal budget? These costs definitely not city obligation. Costs are Federal or air lines responsibility.

H. E. BIDDINGER,
Mayor.

BUTTE, MONT., May 14, 1947.

The Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are advised proposal now made to cut budget fund of Civil Aeronautics Authority in amount set up for manning control towers for commercial air lines. Hope you will investigate this matter, and if commercial air transportation likely to be hampered by such deletion ask that amount be reinstated.

BUTTE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. S. THOMPSON, Manager.

LEWISTOWN, MONT., May 14, 1947.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Representative from Montana,
Washington, D. C.:

Central Montana Chamber of Commerce opposed curtailment proposed CAA budget with reference to funds for operation airport control towers fiscal year 1948. Risk to commercial and private flying excessive.

ASHLEY C. ROBERTS,
Secretary,
Central Montana Chamber of Commerce.

HELENA, MONT., May 15, 1947.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Request you take all possible action to prevent removal of CAA tower and facilities from Helena Municipal Airport.

J. R. WINE, JR., Mayor.

HELENA, MONT., May 15, 1947.

MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Montana Pilots' Association requests you oppose at the hearing attempts being made to eliminate CAA control tower and facilities throughout the State.

J. R. WINE,
Secretary, Montana Pilots' Association.

BILLINGS COMMERCIAL CLUB,
Billings, Mont., May 10, 1947.

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Congressman from Montana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANSFIELD: We are informed Congress is apparently about to cut off 1947-48 operating funds for airport control towers in many cities, including Billings.

I doubt that the city will take over this expense if Federal funds are not available thus closing down this operation at the airport.

You should know the tower was built at substantial cost to Billings at the urgent demand of the CAA during war time and for safety because of the Army ships using the airport along with the commercial transports. CAA agreed to finance the control tower operations annually, providing the city paid for its construction.

CAA insisted the tower was absolutely necessary for public safety in transport flying.

If this is correct, CAA, the commercial airlines operators, and Congress certainly have an obligation not to close this safety device.

It seems to us it is equally obvious the operating costs belong to the agencies charged with public safety and those benefiting financially from their monopoly franchise.

We doubt that Congress can offhand close these towers or demand the local government to finance their operations which we were coerced by a Federal agency in setting up.

Sincerely,
BILLINGS COMMERCIAL CLUB,
H. L. BUCK, Secretary-Manager.

BILLINGS, MONT., May 8, 1947.

HON. MIKE J. MANSFIELD,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand House Appropriations Committee has eliminated all funds for CAA financing and operating traffic-control tower at Billings Airport for fiscal year beginning July 1.

This operation vital to all commercial, military and private flying including personnel and passengers in area bounded Twin Cities, Spokane, Great Falls, Cheyenne. Impossible for municipality to assume this financial responsibility.

Urgently request you do everything possible to have this appropriation restored.

BILLINGS AIRPORT COMMISSION.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] which would increase the amount recommended by the committee approximately \$5,000,000. It occurs to me that the Congress would be assuming a great risk to save \$5,000,000.

From recent investigations made of air accidents, it seems to me considerable emphasis was laid on the necessity of the safe take-off and landing of aircraft. The efficient control of the air towers located on airports is very essential in making take-off and landing safe.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] always makes a good argument. It is true the air towers are stationary and do not move in interstate commerce, but certainly the traffic they control does move in interstate commerce, and if there ever was a time and place where we need uniformity in operation it seems to me that place is in the operation of air fields, including air towers.

Air transportation is in its infancy. It needs to be encouraged. It needs to be made safe and it seems to me, to make a little saving here would be an unwise and dangerous chance to take.

As has been referred to by previous speakers, many of the municipalities are having their own difficult times in financial matters, and their budgets have already been made. It would seem to be the wrong thing to do at this time for the Government, without notice, to refuse funds to carry on this very important activity. I am very much in favor of the amendment and shall vote to have the funds restored.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time in order to lay before the committee the over-all picture of the operations of our Federal airways system. It was first authorized under a very general law which provided for the development and the installation and the operation of anything necessary to maintain the safety of the airways. Under this vague authority lies our entire system of navigation facilities and aides of all sorts. Through the years that has grown, and it has grown in a rather irregular and uncontrolled manner. Last year we appropriated \$39,000,000 for the purpose of all phases of this program, including control towers. The original budget request that came before our subcommittee this year for this program was for \$54,500,000 for fiscal 1948. But, to give you some concept of the problem that confronted this subcommittee, I want you to know that while the hearings were going on we had a supplemental request come to us that raised this total figure to \$63,333,000. Last year the total personnel connected with the over-all operation of the Federal airways system called for 7,331 persons. They had an authorization for a little over 8,000 persons and in the present budget they request in addition to that 4,000 added personnel. Now, that is in the over-all program in which this item involving control towers is a part.

The position of the committee is that we have something here before us now that we are appropriating Federal funds for that is big, and we recognize that it is going to be and should be even bigger. It involves more than just the Federal Government. Of course, it is interstate commerce and traffic, we know that, but it involves municipalities; it involves the air lines themselves, and we have taken this procedure of focusing your attention on the control tower part of this appropriation, which is a purely local matter—control towers are fixed; they do not travel between space—of focusing your attention upon something that we feel should be thoroughly considered by the Congress and for which we have a duty to perform of proposing fundamental law. That is the job for the Congress of the United States right now.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree that it is well to call this to the attention of the House, but will the gentleman agree that it would be safer and perhaps a better procedure to give the Legislative Committee now going into this very same matter, in view of the rapid development taking place since the war ended, a reasonable time—and I mean by reasonable, during the Eightieth Congress—to present legislation dealing with this over-all program for the guidance not only of our Committee on Appropriations, but for the cities and States?

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman from Connecticut raises a very valid point. It will be answered in detail by my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES]. It is true that the fiscal year will be ended in about a month and a

half, and that does not give too much time for a full consideration of this matter. However, I call your attention to the fact that the same warning was made last year. We will not have solved anything by adopting the Rooney amendment. It will be expediency again. We have a job to do here, and we take this opportunity and this method to call it to your attention.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In connection with the question asked by the gentleman from Connecticut, as the gentleman states, the matter was brought up last year when Mr. Raybaut was chairman of the subcommittee. Immediately upon the convening of this Congress and its proper organization the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which is charged with legislative jurisdiction over this subject, commenced the hearings to which the gentleman referred. Those hearings still continue, and the committee is learning all it can and will ultimately present a solution, but it cannot do it by June 30 of this year.

Mr. HORAN. But certainly the airline growth is not waiting. The point we are making here is that we of the Appropriations Committee have to face the facts as they are. We cannot put off beyond the limits of the fiscal year a determination of this matter. I think it is about time that the committee to which the gentleman referred got busy and came out here with some sort of a pattern under which we can appropriate intelligently.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want first to read a telegram I have received from the capital city of my State, Phoenix:

Information has just been received regarding proposed elimination of Federal funds for operation of control towers at CAA designated airport. Phoenix Sky Harbor ranks very high in air traffic movement and during three of the past 12 months led the country.

That may be surprising to a good many of you, but it is a fact easily explained by the strategic location of Phoenix, Ariz.

To in any way restrict present control tower operation would result in creating a hazard that would endanger the thousands of users of Sky Harbor. The City of Phoenix is prevented from contributing in any measure to the maintenance of control tower as budgetary limitations created by State law permit of no funds for this purpose. We strongly urge you to use your influence to the end that adequate Federal funds are furnished for this very important public service.

The foregoing telegram was signed by the Municipal Aeronautics Commission, including John L. McAtee, J. E. Redmand, Martin E. Wist, Charles L. Strouss, A. Lee Moore, Neil B. McGinnis, James Girand, and Walter P. Fulkerson, manager of the airport at Phoenix.

In addition to the message just read, I would like also to offer the following telegram from Tucson, Ariz., and a letter

from Mayor E. T. Houston, of Tucson. The telegram is:

Urge you to exert every possible effort to restore airport control tower funds to CAA Appropriation (H. R. 3311) in interest of safety. This is a serious and important matter. We hope you will point out the needs for more not less navigation control.

AVIATION COMMITTEE.

TUCSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The letter is as follows:

I understand that the House Appropriations Committee has eliminated all funds for CAA operation of traffic-control towers on municipal airports, including Tucson Municipal Airport, Tucson, Ariz., effective July 1, 1947.

The elimination of such funds will throw an undue burden upon the city of Tucson in its operation of Tucson Municipal Airport No. 2. The city budget for the fiscal year 1947-48 will have to be increased in the amount of \$80,000 for the operation of Tucson Municipal Airport, excluding operation of the traffic-control tower. If this additional burden falls on the city, it will cost the city an additional \$30,000 per annum. The city of Tucson has been requested by the War Department to remove all commercial operations from Davis-Monthan Air Base at Tucson by July 1, 1947, which will necessitate activation of the traffic control tower on Tucson Municipal Airport No. 2, which is not now in operation.

We urge that all steps possible be taken to reinstate the appropriation for the operation of airport traffic control tower at Tucson.

Yours very truly,

E. T. HOUSTON, Mayor.

Let me give one more telegram, this one from the mayor of Winslow, Ariz., E. P. Kiernan:

Strongly urge that you support appropriations bill which will provide Federal funds for operation of municipal airport traffic control towers. Tower at local municipal airport has been inoperative since February as no funds available for its operation. Control tower badly needed as a safety measure. City of Winslow not financially able to assume cost of operation.

A look at the air map will reveal the importance of a control tower at Winslow, Ariz. It is a junction point in air way traffic. Winslow is not a large or rich city but its importance as a transportation center far exceeds its size. I call your attention in particular to the message from the capital city of Phoenix, which is on a great interstate airway transportation line. However, the other two cities are also key centers in aeronautics.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. Practically every city concurs in these messages. Our city manager has just contacted me. We also have Stanley Caldwell, civic leader, from northern Ohio. And above all it is what is right, not who is right.

About a year ago when we created the control of air towers it was directed to the attention of this House by myself. Who would want to do away with towers in the lighthouses on our seas and our lakes? Air transportation is much greater. Would it not be more hazardous to do away with the air traffic control towers at this time than to do away with the lighthouses on the seas?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the gentleman is exactly correct. It is a good analogy.

It was said by the preceding gentleman that this problem of control towers needs a different solution so that it would not have to come up here annually. I agree with the gentleman in that respect. I am not asking that this same benefit and support be extended to the hundreds and hundreds of other cities with air fields. There must be a limit somewhere I know, but there are key cities with airports that are the centers of the Nation's air commerce and certainly we ought not to leave this matter of control towers to the hazard of municipal operation.

I am in favor of the Rooney amendment. I hope we can by its adoption take care of control tower operation for at least another year until corrective legislation can be enacted.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am amazed that this Congress should seriously consider at this time abolishing Federal aid to the control towers for air traffic in the United States.

Here we are the greatest country in the world dealing with this sort of transportation which still has a number of elements of danger connected with it. This certainly is false economy to fail to provide these funds for control towers for our air traffic.

There are two aspects to the element of danger. First of all, if we were to let the public know that at one stroke of the pen we would cut out this Federal aid and throw back to each individual city the support and maintenance of these control towers, the public would feel that the element of danger would be increased, and that, I think, would result in a falling off of air traffic.

This situation is not at all comparable to the railroads, in my opinion. There is not the same essential element of danger involved in rail travel today as there is in air travel.

We, as the greatest country in the world, should see to it that we do everything possible to support the development of air traffic.

The definition of economy is the careful, thrifty, and orderly management of one's affairs. To throw back to each individual city the support and maintenance of these control towers is not an orderly management. My city, the city of Milwaukee, is located in a key position, so far as air traffic to the Northwest is concerned. Certainly it, like many other cities, will be affected by this hodge-podge method of dealing with this situation.

I think the majority of the Members of the House feel that it would be false economy to take away from the air-control towers the Federal aid which they have at this time. We cannot afford not to fully support that form of transportation which is very important to the United States, the most important country in the world today, and perhaps that form of transportation that will be the most important for the entire world of the future.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment that would restore and provide funds for our national airport traffic control-tower program. There are two or three things which I wish to say in support of this program.

It is my firm conviction that this is one of the most important issues to the safety of air navigation and our aviation program, which is rapidly expanding day by day. We have a lot more at stake in the consideration of this amendment than a reduction of this amount of money for economy's sake or whether it is a pork-barrel issue, as has been charged. The question is, What policy should we pursue to give us the greatest safety in the operation of our aviation program? Can we have greater safety in the operation by CAA of our control towers in connection with the national airway system, or would we have greater safety by such operation on a local basis?

In determining this issue I trust that we may consider it openly and in accordance with the facts and not approach it from a blind or fallacious argument. It is too important to consider otherwise. The gentleman says the support of this amendment is brought on by wires and messages received from our districts back home. I should like to say to the gentleman that I have received no wire or communication from anyone in my home city or from my district, and I should like to say further that among the list of control towers proposed by the CAA in this program there is not one in my district. I ride the airplanes frequently, and I, as do thousands of people throughout this Nation, want to travel safely and have the realization that the best policy to give me the greatest safety is being pursued.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I do not have any air-control towers in my district, either, and I have received no wires, and I feel exactly the same as the gentleman feels. It is because of the safety involved. I have flown a lot; but if they delete this appropriation for this safety control, I am not going to fly any more at all until they are put back in there again.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, the gentleman no doubt expresses the opinion of a great many other people throughout the country.

Another argument proposed which I wish to refute is that this is permitting the "camel's nose to get under the tent." Such an argument has no foundation in my opinion. The gentleman says that such a program would run into astronomical costs to the Government of \$200,000,000. Such a position is wholly unrealistic and approaches the ridiculous. It is indicated that for the Government to carry out this policy it would be necessary to install and operate a control tower in all of the 5,000 airports in the Nation. In fact, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] stated "that means we have 100 airports for every State in the Union." And the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] said "either we have to cut out the con-

trol towers or we have to furnish, control, and operate them for every airport." I am sure the gentlemen are not serious in making this charge. Certainly anyone can understand there will be no need for control towers in every little airport, and, in fact, many of our larger airports. Under the established policy, there was never any intention of establishing air-control towers and service in any of the airports except those included in our national airway system and where commercial service is provided and where the airports are used by the Army, the Navy, and international and such other service incidental to that particular airfield for safety purposes. Certainly it is contemplated that there will be ultimately some more control towers established, because they will be necessary to the operation of our national airway system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Only part of the airports are what are known as control airports. Those are the only ones that have towers.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I was going to mention that.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the very able gentleman from Nebraska, the chairman of this subcommittee, has given many years of study to the problems of aviation. I have for some years admired him for his interest in promoting aviation. I must frankly say, however, that I am somewhat puzzled at his attitude in connection with this program. Not because I differ with him on a matter of policy, but because, Mr. Chairman, in connection with his insistence of his position on this issue which will in my opinion eliminate the control towers and many of our important and necessary airports, and also with his insistence that the CAA be limited and seriously handicapped in carrying out commitments and our obligation in the development of airports. It strikes me as an attitude of seriously curtailing the continued progress and development of a program that is needed, demanded, and is here to stay.

In the report on page 25 it is stated:

It is the contention of this committee that safety factors are not involved in any way.

Certainly your committee does not mean that. Because the whole question involved is safety. Were it not for the safety program involved there would be no necessity whatsoever for control towers. The report further says the towers should be operated with CAA personnel and under CAA standards.

This means, as I interpret it, that the committee is of the opinion that the CAA program in the operation of these towers is needed and necessary and that CAA should control the personnel and provide the standards. If safety is not involved, Mr. Chairman, why would they want the CAA to control the operation?

Yet the report further says:

The States, cities, and municipalities would merely reimburse the CAA for the cost of the personnel required to operate the towers.

I can see the gentleman requiring Omaha to pay for the operation of a pro-

gram that was controlled and maintained by someone in Washington. I can see the gentleman from Washington saying to the mayor and the council of the city of Spokane that an agency from Washington, D. C., has personnel under their direction and control in Spokane and want you to pay for it. I can see the Federal Government going to any city throughout the country and saying, "Here we have a program that is needed and necessary. I am going to provide the personnel. I am going to control it. But you are going to pay for it." I ask you, is that reasonable? You know what they are going to say. They are going to say, "Here, Mr. Federal Agency, this is a national or an international plan. We are not going to provide the cost of something that is your responsibility." The results will be that a very few control towers will actually operate. The results would be that the progress we have made in air safety would be largely nullified. The results would be that air transportation would be extremely curtailed.

Let me read another statement from the report. On the same page of the same paragraph, it is stated, "air accidents will only be eliminated, it seems to the committee, when people stop flying." I wonder if that is really what the committee believes. I wonder if this House is to take that statement that this committee proposes that we completely eliminate air transportation. Had it not been for the progress we have made in aviation when we became involved in this tragic, global war, where do you think we would have been today? Is there any question in anyone's mind that we would be sitting here in this Chamber legislating for the people of this great country of ours? The gentleman talks about the Army and Navy turning over 400 airports to CAA and there are some yet to be transferred. Does the gentleman not realize that these airports cost the taxpayers of this country enormous sums of money which would not have been necessary had we provided adequate national airport development beforehand? Does the gentleman also recognize that should there be a future emergency we will not have the time to provide such needed facilities? Ah, yes; this, Mr. Chairman, transcends political issues and arguments for expediency.

I have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and we too have made extensive and exhaustive studies of this program. For several years I have studied it, and there are some members of this committee who have given their time and efforts to this program for more than 25 years. We have held hearings constantly on this question since January. We reported out the airport bill in the last Congress and considered all phases of the aviation program at that time and in previous Congresses. We have seen the actual operation of control towers and all the technical phases of it. We have seen how necessary it is for the proper operation which can be attained only by proper control to the various landing approaches like the ILS, GCA, and FIDO operation. These are

new developments in landing of our aircraft, and even yet in the experimental stages. Yes, we have observed the importance of the operation of these air-control towers from Los Angeles, from Washington to New York, and throughout the Nation—even on nonstop flights from the west to the east coast. To be sure the approach control is necessary to reliable and safe clearance of aircraft into and out of airports under such restricted conditions of ceiling and visibility, and there can be safe operation only when both the airport-tower personnel and airway-traffic personnel are responsible to the same central authority. We have considered boundary lines and local control, but it is the considered opinion and best judgment from the experience of our committee, from the experience of the industry, from the experience of the agency which is administering this program, that we will have greater safety in this national-airport system by the Federal Government which is the only central authority assuming and carrying out this responsibility. I cannot urge, Mr. Chairman, too strongly the importance of this amendment in the carrying out of a policy that this Government must adopt and must continue in connection with the operation of the actual life line. Yes, the very heart of our national airway system.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I favor the Rooney amendment.

The largest city in my constituency is Portland, Maine. I have a letter from the Portland City Council—and I do not know why anybody should be apologetic about having a city in his district which is affected by this legislation. The city council writes me as follows:

If this cut is upheld by Congress, it will remove from CAA's appropriation funds sufficient to operate a control tower at the Portland Municipal Airport. The city has gone ahead with construction of the tower with a commitment from CAA to finance its operation from Federal funds, and CAA has planned to locate a mobile control tower here pending the completion of the permanent tower.

The operation of the tower is essential to the safety of flying at the airport, and its cost would be a burden which the city should not be expected to carry. Even more importantly, the nature of the responsibility is a Federal one, inasmuch as it involves the control of air traffic within a radius of 50 miles or more from the airport and across State lines.

I also have in my hand the 1947 national airport plan of the Department of Commerce which shows that Portland, Maine, is being raised from a class 3 airport to a class 4 airport.

In the summer of 1944 a Mitchell bomber, an Army plane, was approaching the airport in foggy weather. A wing tip of the bomber hit a trailer village. The bomber crashed. Eighteen people in the trailer village were killed, the entire crew of the plane was killed, the plane itself of course was a total loss to the United States and the trailer village was largely destroyed by fire. I introduced

appropriate legislation in the Seventy-ninth Congress to compensate, insofar as money could compensate, for the losses and deaths involved. The legislation was passed. I forget what the aggregate cost of that accident was to the United States, but it certainly must have run very deeply into six figures. I believe that accident would not have occurred if we had had a control tower.

I believe the responsibility for air safety is a Federal responsibility. If it is not to be a Federal responsibility then there should be some general legislation making the contrary provision.

I want to call attention to just one thing, on page 25 of the committee report there appears the statement:

Air accidents will only be eliminated, it seems to the committee, when people stop flying.

Is that the way we are going to eliminate air accidents? It is not my idea of the way to do it or the way to approach this question.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, as most of the Members know, I come from Kansas City, Mo., which has a large airport. It is the geographical center of the United States. At this airport, stop daily many of the transcontinental planes.

Kansas City is very much interested in this question.

I rise in support of the amendment, reluctantly I may say, in view of my very great respect for the distinguished members of this Committee. As we have read the press during the last few months we have seen to our dismay an increasing number of accidents in air traffic. There is nothing which contributes more to the safety of the American traveling public by air, perhaps, than these control towers.

I received the other day a telegram from the Honorable William E. Kemp, the distinguished mayor of Kansas City, in which he set out his views. I think these views are important because I think they perhaps reflect the views and the situation in most of the cities in the United States. He points out, and I want to read a paragraph or two from his telegram:

Assuming city elected to assume and carry on operation of control tower, it would in this and other cities, result in lack of uniformity control-tower operation which might inject element of serious hazard to safety of air-transport operation. So far as Kansas City is concerned, cost to Federal Government of control-tower operation is practically offset by approximately 10,000 square feet space furnished Federal Government at municipal airport for Post Office, Weather Bureau, and CAA communications. Am advised same situation exists most municipal airports throughout country.

Mr. Chairman, I take these few minutes to ask the membership for the serious consideration of this amendment because it means not only the continuation of a very valuable safety-device program, as the mayor of Kansas City pointed out, but if you do away with it from the Federal standpoint you will

have no uniformity over the United States.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. In reference to Kansas City, the gentleman has a very curious and interesting situation in which the airport is in one State and the population in another.

Mr. BELL. I will have to correct the gentleman on that. We do have an airport on the Kansas side, but the municipal airport is in Kansas City, Mo.

Mr. HINSHAW. But there is likewise a great deal of population in Kansas City, Kans.

Mr. BELL. They are just a little suburb of Kansas City, Mo. Though we do graciously admit that Kansas is a State and in reasonably good standing with the Union.

Mr. HINSHAW. But the control of the aircraft is over a 25-mile zone which crosses into the State of Kansas.

Mr. BELL. That does not make it any less necessary; if we are going to avoid these accidents we have to have control.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am trying to help the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I know a good many pilots fly into Kansas City. I know that the lives not only of our pilots but of the flying public depend upon these safety devices. I hope the Congress, in view of its commendable desire to save money, will not save at the wrong place. Let us not be penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot allow to go unchallenged the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri relative to my home town Kansas City, Kans., being a suburb of Kansas City, Mo. It is no part of, and has no connection with, the Missouri municipality, which possibly affixed the name of the fair State of Kansas to give an aura of respectability.

Kansas City, Kans., is a city, a first-class city, of the first class, in its own right. The airport is a municipal airport and it is bigger and better in all aspects than the Kansas City, Mo., airport. It is big enough, good enough, so much bigger and so much better than the Missouri field that it is the Kansas City, Kans., municipal airport at which the President's plane, the "Sacred Cow," arrives and from which it departs.

It was at Fairfax—Kansas City, Kans.—Airport that thousands of North American B-25 bombers were built and tested during the war.

Its runways are long enough, wide enough, heavy enough to accommodate any plane now made or in the planning stage. Yet as spacious as it is it is subject to still further enlargement.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. REEVES. Will the gentleman inform the committee as to how many

commercial air lines utilize the airport in Kansas City, Kans.?

Mr. SCRIVNER. There are practically none; I will state that frankly. And, if you want, I can go into details why, but that does not have anything to do with this particular debate.

But, in all seriousness, I feel quite sure that my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL], was not too serious in his statement concerning my city, of which we are properly proud. But, he has presented a situation that has developed, because those two airports are just across the Missouri River, the dividing line that makes a great difference in more ways than one. The pattern in and out of those two airports do cross. There is some conflict, and it was with some difficulty that we were able to convince the CAA that these two towers should be interlocked and coordinated. There have been, to my recollection, no serious accidents on either one of those airports in the last several years.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I just want to endorse completely what the gentleman from Kansas has said. The airport to which he refers is a magnificent airport, beautifully designed, beautifully located, and it is imperative that the important work that goes on over here should not be curtailed.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I assume the gentleman is now speaking of our Kansas City, Kans., municipal airport.

Mr. REEVES. I am speaking with great respect and admiration and praise of the Kansas City, Kans., airport.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I thank the gentleman.

Let me make this further observation before I close. It would seem to me that one job should be done by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. They have been studying airplane accident prevention now for some time, and they should come to us with some remedial legislation which would clarify this situation. In view of the fact that many of the airports to which we have referred handle a large number of Government planes, for which the municipal airports cannot make a charge, there should be some logical, sane solution for the situation that now faces us. I trust that the committee will soon, in their wisdom, bring in that type of legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman has brought up a very important point with reference to two airports in two different States that should be interlocked. They are very similar to Bolling Field and Anacostia Field and the Washington National Airport. If they were going to be operated by separate jurisdictions, that interlocking relationship could not be properly applied for the safety of the aircraft using both airports, and that is one of the problems of our committee.

Mr. SCRIVNER. My reaction from the statements made here was not that there would be any complete kicking loose from the CAA in the operation of these towers, but that only the airports

themselves or the cities owning them should pay for the operation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, that is correct, but the gentleman's airport does not receive the revenues that the other airport does.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right. That is why some equitable plan should be proposed.

Mr. HINSHAW. On the other hand, it has a very important function to perform.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have not been able to get the figures, but my recollection is that well over 60 percent of the traffic of the Kansas City, Kans., municipal airport is Government traffic, including Reserve flyers, for which there can be no charge.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment gives every Member of the House an opportunity to show whether he really believes in Federal economy or whether it is merely a political issue. The Congress last year authorized the expenditure of one-half billion dollars as Federal aid for an airport construction program. The policy of the Federal Government in assisting the localities in the construction of airports in my judgment is sound and I gladly supported that measure. There are in the United States at the present time 4,723 airports and it is contemplated when the program is completed there will be 6,300.

At 130 of these airports, the Federal Government is now operating air control towers, the cost of which amounted to over \$3,000,000 this year. The operation of these towers was assumed by the Government during the war as a defense measure and the facilities were used extensively by the armed forces. The war is now over. These towers have reverted to civilian use. Instead of relinquishing this war activity it is proposed to extend the service to 19 additional airports during the next year at a total cost to the Government of approximately \$5,000,000. Many other localities which have not yet received the official nod from the CAA are also clamoring for towers.

One airport at which the Government now operates the control tower is located in the city of Richmond, which I have the honor to represent. I ask the Members of this House by what process of logic and fairness can I support a program under which the Federal Government operates a control tower in my district and then vote to deny it to Oshkosh, or any other airport in the United States. If, however, this service is extended to the 6,300 airports which we will have in the United States, it will cost this Government over \$200,000,000 each year to maintain air-control towers alone. In my judgment, therefore, we must transfer this cost to the localities where it properly belongs before it reaches such tremendous proportions.

In fact the cost of maintaining these towers should not be borne by either the Federal Government or by the localities, but it should be paid by those who use the airways; those who receive the special benefits which these towers provide. Reference has been made on the floor of

the House to our great highway system. The Federal Government contributed to the construction of our highways, but it has never contributed to local maintenance, and, moreover, the highways of this country have been financed largely through the gasoline tax which has properly placed the burden on the highway users. Let us follow the same policy with regard to the airways.

The argument has been advanced that this sudden action will not give the localities an opportunity to arrange local financing. This action is not sudden. The proposal to eliminate these funds from the Federal budget was made last year and the same argument was used against it. We come now to another year and unless something is done about it we will have the same argument next year and the year following and on ad infinitum.

We need to work out a definite pattern of Federal, State, local and private cooperation in our entire air-transportation program. That pattern will never be worked out, however, as long as the Federal Government continues to foot all the bills. The elimination of some of these Government contributions, on the other hand, will hasten consideration of such a program of coordination. The time to act is now before this octopus gets any larger. I, therefore, urge you to stand by the committee and vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 2 minutes, in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Is it not a fact that the operation cost of a large airport is around \$1,000,000?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. What we are arguing about here today is an item of \$4,800,000 for the payment of salaries of operators in these control towers. All the safety aids and equipment and all the other operation and maintenance are there. There are only 3 or 4 large airports in the United States where a maximum of 16 of these operators are employed. They include New York City, Chicago, Dallas, and the Washington Airport. It costs about \$56,000 for those 16 operators in New York City, Chicago, Dallas, and Washington. The other thing we are arguing about is the from 6 to 16 operators in the smaller airports.

What you are really arguing about is an average cost of \$32,000 for the payment of these operators of the control towers, whereas the maintenance and operation equipment is in the bill. All you are arguing about is whether or not these commercial air lines and non-scheduled air lines, States, and communities should cooperate and pay for all or part of the salaries of these operators.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that that is not only true but it is also true that these towers are not needed in all of the 6,300 airports that we will

have in the United States. If the localities have to provide them, we will not have them, but if the Federal Government provides the towers free of cost to the localities, then all of the 6,300 airports will demand them.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Missouri to the amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: Strike out "\$70,982,000" and insert "\$71,081,484."

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Missouri, my good friend and colleague [Mr. BAKEWELL], for including the amount necessary to operate the control tower at Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph, Mo., in his substitute amendment.

Most of the Members who have spoken in favor of this proposal refer to the Rooney amendment. Therefore, I feel that it is necessary in order to protect myself and the two other Members who are in the same position as I to offer this amendment to the Rooney amendment.

The Rooney amendment seeks to restore in this bill the amount necessary for Federal control-tower operation during the next fiscal year for all of the control towers that have been operated with Federal funds during this fiscal year plus 19 others that were proposed to be so operated at the time the budget was submitted.

Unfortunately, there are three of us, namely, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE], and myself, who each have an airport in our district that is qualified to receive Federal funds for control-tower operation and has been approved by the CAA, but approved too late to submit the amount necessary for such control-tower operation to the Budget.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I cannot yield at the moment.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, I am going to help him out a little bit.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Then, I am glad to yield. I need the help.

Mr. STEFAN. How much are you increasing this amount?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. My amendment increases the Rooney amendment by \$99,484.

Mr. STEFAN. What airports does that take in—the one at St. Joe, and what others?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. St. Joseph, Mo., New Orleans, La., and White Plains, N. Y.

Mr. STEFAN. You missed about 45 others that are in the same category. But do you include the equipment?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. No.

Mr. STEFAN. You have left out a lot. There are many things that you have left out there.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that I did not include anything except the amount necessary to pay the salaries of the personnel of the

control towers because I am informed that there are sufficient funds in this bill for tower equipment and maintenance.

Mr. STEFAN. May I ask my friend how he knows that this money will go to these towers? Has he consulted the CAA?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Yes; I have.

Mr. STEFAN. And they approve this and the Budget approves it? The CAA has approved it, and they said that if you would get this amendment in they would put it into these towers? There are 48 or 49 other towers in the same category, and the one at St. Joe and these others want the same thing.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HEBERT. Let me quote from a letter from Mr. Wright in which he tells us to come to Congress and get this appropriation and that they have approved of it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is correct. I intend to cover that.

The gentleman from New York indicated yesterday that we were taking these amounts out of thin air. I have in my hand a letter from Mr. T. P. Wright, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, in which he says:

The St. Joseph tower was commissioned by the Civil Aeronautics Administration with funds transferred by the city to the Government on December 17, 1946. The traffic figures in points per month are as follows—

I will quote only the one for March of this year—

March 1947, 10,416 points.

It is a jig field.

I continue to quote:

From the above it appears that the St. Joseph tower now meets the minimum requirements of 7,500 points for Federal operation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Not at the moment. Mr. Wright says in regard to the funds necessary for the operation of the tower at Rosecrans Field, St. Joseph, Mo.:

If the St. Joseph tower is included for establishment during the fiscal year 1948, it will be necessary to add \$28,734 to provide for a basic minimum complement of one chief airport traffic controller and five airport traffic controllers for air operation.

I am informed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] that the amount necessary to operate the control tower at the New Orleans field is \$35,755. This figure was obtained in the same way, from the same source. I am also informed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] that the amount necessary to operate the control tower at the airport at West Plains, N. Y., is \$35,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, those figures were obtained from Mr. Wright, from the same source and in the same manner.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], for whom I have a very high regard—and I want to thank him at this time for the courtesies he extended me upon the many occasions I have discussed this matter with him—indicated that those of us who are not included in this are going to oppose the amendment and the substitute amendment should my amendment fail. That is not true. We shall support them. We are not like dogs in the manger who, because they cannot eat hay, will not permit others to do so. We think we should be fair about this proposition, and that those fields that have qualified and have been recommended should be included, and the others as well.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman realize that this matter has never been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget; that it has never been submitted to the members of the committee, either the majority or the minority; that the gentleman is now airing it without its having been given consideration by those who are economy-minded in this Congress, with the idea that if there was merit to the proposition it would be granted by the committee?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Does not the gentleman think that the Civil Aeronautics Administration knows the amount necessary to operate these towers, because these towers are being operated with municipal funds under their supervision, and have been for the past year?

Mr. ROONEY. I had the mistaken impression apparently that the Congress was running the Congress and not the CAA.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman that Congress should always decide the amount necessary to operate Government agencies.

Mr. ROONEY. I personally resent Mr. Wright or anyone else horning into this matter.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. But the fact remains that he knows the amount necessary to operate these towers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to extend their remarks on this amendment at this point in the RECORD may have that permission.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amend-

ment. The most important argument in its favor is the fact that we need uniform regulations in operation of our airports throughout the United States. If this is admitted by this House, and from what I have heard I believe this is a fact, therefore, the Federal Government should pay for the operation of these control towers. Every Member of this House is in accord on the absolute necessity for these towers. Just recently we have seen the lives of eight prominent officials of one air line and the operator of a private plane taken because there was no control tower operated at a particular airport. Thus we are convinced that we need the control towers, and the need for uniform operation of the towers is absolutely necessary if we hope to protect the lives of our citizens who utilize the air lines as a means of transportation. I hope that the House will pass this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. Of all the amendments offered on this section of the bill the one offered by Mr. ROONEY is the most effective. I do not believe any of the others have been as carefully thought out or that they would meet the situation as effectively as would the amendment of the gentleman from New York. I am hopeful that the House will accept Mr. ROONEY's amendment and in so doing save the air-traffic-control program.

We cannot evaluate this program in dollars and cents. It is a matter going to the very heart of aviation development in this country.

Yesterday I received a telegram from the Honorable Martin H. Kennelly, mayor of Chicago. In substance Mayor Kennelly advises that if Federal funds are eliminated for control-tower operations and this financial obligation is placed upon municipalities the safety of air operations will be greatly impaired because few communities are going to be in a position to pay the cost.

All local communities are already hard pressed for funds. Some of them may be so hard pressed that they may not give full cooperation in this important safety program. From coast to coast there will be missing links in this chain of control towers unless the operation of the program remains Federal. We cannot very well afford to have a single missing link in this safety chain.

While I appreciate the laudable aim of the subcommittee to reduce Government operation expenses, I cannot go along with it when I feel that by holding back Federal funds we may be holding back development of aviation. Sometime in the future when commercial air operations are on a more profitable basis I can see these costs being borne by the air lines themselves, or by the municipalities, or by joint cooperation between the air lines and the municipalities. But I do not believe either the cities or air lines are ready to assume this cost now.

We cannot afford to gamble with the safety factors involving our Nation's airways. For a while, at least, the Federal Government must continue to give encouragement to aviation in this and other forms. We must never lose sight of the

fact that the air lines of America are a strong link in our national defense. Cutting off of funds for the operation of air-traffic control towers at this time would, in my opinion, be a very serious mistake.

I appeal to the Members of the House to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment. The defeat of this amendment means the curtailment of air navigation facilities in this Nation and at a time when we can ill afford to do so.

I am in receipt of a letter from the State director of aeronautics of the State of Alabama in which he states that the Department of Aeronautics is particularly concerned over the reductions proposed for the establishment of new air navigational facilities and for the maintenance and operation of existing air navigation facilities; also the elimination of all funds for the operation of airport control towers, except the one at Washington National.

I am greatly concerned over the elimination of funds for the operation of airport control towers as it means the elimination of the tower in Montgomery, Ala. I am in receipt of a telegram from Col. W. A. Gayle, city commissioner of Montgomery, in which he urges the continuation of the control tower at Dannelly Field, the municipal airport. Montgomery is not in financial condition to support this tower. The city owned one of the finest fields in the country, namely Gunter Field, which was turned over to the Federal Government at the outbreak of the war. This field has never been returned and it became necessary for the city to go out at great expense and purchase other property. It is not a question of the city not wanting to assume the responsibility of the control tower, but it is a question of this city and many others not being able to do so. It is a matter of public safety. The cost is small in comparison to the benefits obtained. We just cannot fail to continue to make air travel safe by continuing appropriations not only for control towers but for the improvement of landing systems.

I trust that nothing will be done in this bill to affect air safety of the aeronautical communications stations. We have one of these in my district at Evergreen, Ala. These stations are important to safe air travel.

It is true that this Congress must practice some economy. However let us be careful where the cuts are made. Let us not make them in a case like this where the lives of so many people are at stake.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I realize the Appropriations Committee is faced with a most difficult problem in carrying out the reduction of Government expenditures and at the same time examining every individual item and evaluating it. The committee is to be congratulated upon its diligent effort with respect to this particular bill. I take this time, however, to call to the attention of the House the provision with respect to the need for payment of the cost of air traffic control towers. This item has been eliminated from the bill approved by the committee, and,

while I am most reluctant to oppose its judgment, yet, in this particular instance, believe that the committee is in error.

Only last year, the air-control tower was established at the Topeka, Kans., municipal airport. This was in furtherance of the policy determining that these facilities were the responsibility of the Federal Government.

The present bill seeks to eliminate this policy without notice to the municipalities involved, the result of which would require the closing of these safety devices. The cities, at this late date, would have no opportunity to either levy taxes or assessments against the air lines for the purpose of continuing the program.

Because the Government established the program and because it is necessary to the safety of the traveling public and because of the inability of the municipalities to cope with the situation in so short a time, I must oppose this item of the bill and vote for the amendment restoring the appropriation providing for the cost of these air-control towers.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor this amendment because I firmly believe we need uniform control of airport towers as a necessity to the safety to air travel.

The comparative saving that would be realized by not adopting this amendment cannot be compared to the possibility of one air accident that might occur through lack of or inefficiency of proper airport tower control. We cannot expect to refer this responsibility to the cities, counties, and States who have depended upon this service, because they may not be equipped to handle it and the result would be the danger of air accidents which might otherwise be prevented.

I agree with requests I have received from the Los Angeles Municipal Airport Commission and from the Long Beach Municipal Airport that this service be continued. I therefore urge the members of the Committee to adopt this amendment.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, in our desires to economize in expenditures of public moneys, frequently we are confronted with difficult decisions. No one can deny the fact that we simply must reduce Federal expenditures when and if possible. In the present instance, however, it seems to me that the elimination of necessary funds to provide for control towers would certainly be false economy.

We recall some months ago when we had more than the normal number of air tragedies a great hue and cry went up throughout the entire country demanding a reduction in air tragedies and contending for greater degrees of safety. These days many of us are accustomed to and, in fact, are compelled to use air transportation in order to meet our many important engagements. We not only travel by air ourselves but our constituents, friends, and families are fast becoming accustomed to and demanding the right to travel by air.

As an example of the advantages of air travel, some months ago I was in St. Louis, Mo., and needed to return to

Washington by the most direct and quickest route, when I learned that the fastest train scheduled from that city to the Capital required 22 hours, whereas by air only 4 hours were needed.

This is an air-minded age. Thousands of our fine young men by reason of their military experience are eager to continue their air careers. Airplanes have come to be essential in this modern age for convenience, commerce, and national security. Maintenance of air-traffic control towers increases safety in too many ways to enumerate here.

The argument to discontinue this vital service is no more logical than for a person to discontinue the carrying of insurance, either personal or property. We have become accustomed to paying insurance premiums and are glad that we seldom suffer losses.

If, as, and when the Federal funds are discontinued and the matter of safety controls at airports reverts to municipalities, counties, and States, all semblance of uniformity will be lost. The pilots will not have time to familiarize themselves with the various types and forms of safety devices, if any. In my judgment, we simply cannot justify the striking of necessary funds from this bill which would carry on essential air-control towers. I strongly urge the adoption of the pending amendment.

Mr. ELSAESSER. Mr. Chairman, many municipalities operate air fields for commercial aviation that can and have been used by our Army and naval aircraft. These fields are a part of our national defense system. They are available at all times to the Government. The control towers at these fields have been operated by our Government for many years. These control towers are safety devices that are absolutely necessary. The omission of an appropriation to continue the operation of the control towers will compel the municipality to bear the operating expenses. Some of our cities and larger communities cannot afford this additional expense which would impair the service rendered by these towers.

I favor the restoration of the amount needed to operate these control towers in this appropriation bill. It is one service our Government can render to the air bases of America.

We have held many long hearings on air safety, and our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is fully aware of the need for every safety device we can obtain to make air travel safer. Certainly a properly operated and completely staffed control tower is imperative. We cannot afford to cut expenditures where the safety of human lives is involved. The amount of money needed for this service is not large and our country will be amply repaid for this service to our airfields.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, elimination of the \$4,849,000 item requested in the Commerce Department budget for the operation of air-traffic control towers at 148 airports is almost certain to result in serious disarrangement of air traffic and in increased danger of landing and take-off accidents.

It is entirely possible that a careful examination of the list of airports where the CAA now operates control towers would reveal a number of instances where the local municipal government could well afford to take over this expense, as suggested by the committee. This would result in a substantial saving to the Government, and would not interfere with aviation operations or increase hazards. This investigation certainly would be a better approach to the problem than the outright elimination of controls at 148 airports.

Such an investigation would reveal, however, that the cities of Great Falls and Billings, Mont., are not financially able to carry the burden of control-tower expenses at this time, and certainly not upon the short notice given them by this action of the Appropriations Committee. I am advised that it would cost the city of Great Falls \$29,000 a year to pay for the control tower. The city is not able to provide those funds, as I have been advised by the mayor, Mr. Hjalmer C. Johnson. Mayor H. E. Biddinger, of Billings, also has informed me that his city cannot assume this burden now.

Both Great Falls and Billings are important crossroads of air travel in the Northwest. Both are served by several regular flights daily of northwest and western air lines, and the volume of private air traffic has increased tremendously since the war ended. Great Falls is the terminal of the inland air route to Alaska, a route of increasingly great importance both commercially and for defense purposes. If the House approves without change the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, the busy airports at Great Falls and Billings, serving a vast area in Montana and Wyoming, will be without control towers.

It has not been very long since a converted Army training plane and a transport carrying eight Delta Air Lines officials collided in a take-off accident in the South. This accident almost certainly would not have happened if there had been a control tower at this airport. The tower would have notified each pilot of the whereabouts of the other, and many lives would have been saved. But if the committee's action is allowed to stand, similar accidents will increase in number throughout the country as control towers are taken out of operation. We do not want this to happen at Great Falls and Billings, or at any other city which is unable to carry the burden of control tower operation.

In the interests of air safety and the successful operation of air carriers, I sincerely hope that the requested funds will be restored in this bill.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the restoration of the Government funds for operation of the air-control towers by the CAA, I do it with the keen realization that I am speaking for an area in which air-control towers represent the difference, in many cases, between an easy, successful landing, and a disastrous, deadly crash. The jagged peaks and the deep canyon valleys of the Rocky Mountains make it absolutely mandatory that control towers be used.

It seems to me that the proper control of air traffic is a Federal function, since from the time the plane leaves the ground until it reaches its destination it is almost entirely interstate traffic.

In my opinion, this action would leave the responsibility of such operations to the respective communities, which cannot operate as efficiently, effectively, and economically as the coordinated activities of the CAA.

The Salt Lake Airport in my district is vitally located, and a place where a great number of Army as well as civilian airplanes use its facilities. It is a key airport to the Intermountain West and the Pacific coast. Likewise, many of the other strategically located airports throughout the country will be affected. In view of these facts and the numerous Federal uses made of the municipal airports throughout our country, it seems only logical to restore these funds.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get together on limiting the time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes, the last five to be reserved to the committee to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, why cannot each man who desires to speak on this have at least 5 minutes? Some of us have been sitting here for 3 days awaiting a chance to be heard. I object if we cannot get 5 minutes apiece.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to move that debate close for I do not want to cut it off.

Mr. RIVERS. Then just give each man 5 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean that the hour will be divided among those now indicating a desire to be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. It does, less the 5 minutes reserved by the committee to close the debate.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that 20 Members have sought recognition. Five minutes will be reserved for the committee to close. Each Member will be recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEBERT: to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. BAKEWELL. Strike out "\$71,045,734" and insert "\$71,081,484."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I offer as a substitute

for the Bakewell amendment is merely a safety valve to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE]. The Cole amendment is a matter of arithmetic merely. In order to bring three additional airports into the list, airports which have been approved by the CAA, my amendment is to bring the Bakewell amendment into conformance with the total amount of money required.

In passing let me cite the situation of the New Orleans airport and direct your attention to the fact that the Army was operating this airport and without warning canceled out its operation, which naturally threw the airport onto the local community to operate.

Mr. Wright, in his letter to me of April 15, makes the statement:

At the time our fiscal year 1948 budget request was prepared, the air traffic at the New Orleans airport was under the control of the military authorities. This office had no knowledge of the volume of traffic at this airport, nor did we know that the military intended to relinquish their control. Therefore, funds for the operation of a control tower at the New Orleans airport are not included in the budget request now being reviewed by the Congress.

We have received a recommendation from our fourth regional office requesting that this Administration assume the operation of the New Orleans airport traffic-control tower as of July 1, 1947. Unfortunately, it will not be possible for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to change our fiscal year 1948 budget request at this time. For us to take favorable action on the region's recommendation, the Congress will have to add the New Orleans tower to the approved list while the appropriations bill for fiscal year 1948 is being considered.

That is what I am adding in this connection today, taking the advice of Mr. Wright, who has approved it on the authority of his own agency. I take full cognizance of the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and I agree wholeheartedly with him that the Congress is running the country in the ultimate analysis, which is one of the reasons why I cannot understand why he asks if this matter has been referred to the Bureau of the Budget. Certainly the Congress is running the country and, in my own way of thinking, the Budget Bureau stands merely as a witness before any committee the same as the representative of the CAA would stand as a witness and I would take the word of the expert and the advice of the expert, Mr. Wright.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER].

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I have 2½ minutes allotted me. Is it possible for me to yield those 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT]?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not possible to do that.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment and want to read a wire that I received from the Honorable Harley E.

Knox, mayor of the city of San Diego, as follows:

SAN DIEGO, CALIF., May 10, 1947.
HON. CHARLES K. FLETCHER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We are informed House Appropriations Committee has reduced funds for CAA grants airport projects by 50 percent. We realize need for economy and will not protest this action at this time. However, we are also notified that the same committee has eliminated all funds for CAA operation traffic-control towers municipal airports. This function has been carried on as Federal responsibility for many years. We do not believe that the Congress is doing other than kidding us by transferring Federal responsibilities to already overburdened municipal government and calling it economy. We strongly protest this action, and I am authorized to tell you that local government will not pay for operation of these towers. Strongly urge your assistance maintaining airport control towers as necessary and proper expenditure involving safety control of interstate transportation. Kindest personal regards.

HARLEY KNOX.

I have voted for every Republican economy measure on the floor of Congress, but I, for one, will not accept the responsibility for the deaths which would ensue if air-traffic control towers were not operated uniformly.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as being very strongly in favor of the Rooney amendment, which provides that the Federal Government will continue to operate the air-control towers for another year.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I think the point has been repeatedly made that this involves a considerable expenditure on the part of the Federal Government. I believe the fact has been overlooked, however, that on every air-line ticket there is a 15-percent tax. Certainly the people have a right to get something for that 15 percent.

Mr. FLETCHER. The gentleman is correct. I believe the Federal Government should carry this financial burden at the present time. In San Diego, for example, Government planes use the municipal airport, and the Government gets revenue from commercial aircraft engaged in interstate commerce. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has a sane approach, and that is to have the Federal Government carry the financial burden for the personnel of the air-control towers for this year only until a permanent and more equitable plan can be placed before Congress. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] informs me that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is considering a bill to provide a fair division of the operating costs of air-control towers between those who use and receive benefits from the operation of the towers. Until such a measure is enacted into law the Federal Government should continue to operate the towers from which plane traffic is routed in and out of airports.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment.

As I understand it, the amendment only changes the present bill by around \$4,899,000; in other words, it changes the sum inserted in the bill from \$66,133,000 to \$70,982,000. This is the amount requested by the CAA, but for some reason the committee, in the exercise of its power, has limited or cut off this amount, and the committee also provided that none of the funds shall be used for paying employees of traffic-control towers, which to me is one of the most important parts of the safety-device installations.

Mr. Chairman, the Seventy-ninth Congress went on record as being in favor of the development of the airports of this country, and we passed a bill providing the sum of \$500,000,000 to be spent over a certain term of years. What good is it for this Government to go just half-way in providing a system of airports unless we provide for the operation in a safe way of those airports? This would provide something that we cannot continue unless we have air-control towers. It is very much like the Congress did in providing the terminal-leave bonds for the veterans. The bonds in the hands of the veterans are not worth a cent to them for use now. Those bonds cannot be cashed nor be negotiated for a period of 5 years. They have to just sit and wait and hope for a period of 5 years before they can get payment on the bonds.

Now this is the same thing we are doing here. We are in favor of this program, yet they want to restrict the use of the funds. It is just as logical to say that we shall not pay the salaries of the employees of the post offices in the various communities as to refuse to pay the employees for the operation of traffic-control towers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, the proposition of eliminating control-tower personnel from Federal support presents a very peculiar problem to the city of Long Beach, Calif. Our municipal airport, one of the finest on the west coast, was taken over, to a large extent, by the Army at the beginning of hostilities. Now that the war is over and the city has agreed to allow a considerable Army Air Force training establishment to remain permanently, we are endeavoring vainly to get the rest of the airport freed from the shackles of Army control.

So far we have had little success, although month after month we have promises that the ponderous wheels of governmental red tape will grind finally to a successful conclusion, but only God knows when this may be. Certainly neither the Army, nor War Assets, nor the humble Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth District has any real idea when this may be accomplished, although we are all in agreement as to its desirability.

So now, with the Army still in legal control, and with the airport partially

used by an Army training command, we are asked to assume financial responsibility for the tower operations.

Mr. Chairman, we of Long Beach should like, at least, to get the Army out of our airport before we are called upon to pay for operating expenses for tower personnel which serves the Army as well as commercial traffic. Perhaps some of you have similar conditions in your district.

I intend to support the amendment.

THE LIVES OF AIR TRAVELERS MUST BE PROTECTED

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I am for economy but not for false economy that may endanger and even cost many lives if control towers should be operated by municipalities with employees who have no experience whatsoever. As one who saw the very first airplane flight at Fort Meyer, Va., in 1909 and who advocated and voted for the bill establishing the air-mail service, I have always been interested in the progress of aviation. Consequently when former Representative Nichols, of Oklahoma, urged an investigation into air-line accidents and crashes I, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, realizing the need for such an investigation, succeeded in having a resolution reported by the committee and passed by the House. Some 8 months thereafter the committee made a report and one of those joining in the signing of the report was the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. I was greatly impressed with the splendid investigation conducted by the committee and with the report of its findings and recommendations. Today I was very much interested when the gentleman from California made his speech urging favorable action on the Rooney amendment to increase the appropriation to \$70,892,000 to provide for the operation of control towers. While the situation and need for the operation of the control towers by Civil Aeronautics Administration had been explained in telegrams which I had received from Mayor Martin H. Kennelly, of Chicago, from the Aviation Committee of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, and others, I was greatly impressed with the sound facts and reasoning given by the gentleman from California in urging the increased appropriation. I am satisfied that his statement and that of his colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], who also made a convincing plea, made a favorable impression upon the membership. I observed between 40 and 50 Members on the floor who sought to obtain recognition when the gentleman from Nebraska moved to close debate.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the substitute or amendment offered to the Rooney amendment will not prevail and that the original Rooney amendment will be adopted. I have always believed in safety, especially in air travel, and feel that the public is entitled to all the protection and safeguards that this Government can give it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, during the last few months it has been my duty as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to sit in on the hearings investigating air accidents, and I assure you that that committee is getting ready to make a report. It is quite evident that the responsibility of the Government is to aid and assist in air navigation in this country. It is absolutely necessary that air control be uniform. It is a matter of national defense and security to the people of this country and I know that no one wants the blood of any one who might be killed in an air accident on his hands. I state unequivocally that any one who will oppose uniformity of air control tower operation in this country will have on his hands the blood of any one who dies as a result of this very carelessly laid down plan and scheme. It is very necessary for the defense of our country that we have a strong air force. We are now first in the world, but to create such a chaotic condition as the proposal here to cut out national support of air control towers would bring us to the last place. Now, until the necessary legislation is enacted, we must continue the plan that we now have.

It would be penny-wise and pound-foolish for us to cut out the national uniform system of air-control towers in this country.

The network of airports throughout this country which would be benefited by this legislation is extensively used by the Army and Navy. It is reasonable to expect that the National Government should participate in keeping the control towers of these airports in operation. If the Federal Government ceases to participate in the operation of these control towers it is evident that there will be a tendency of various airports to adopt special and separate regulations. This would result in chaos in the entire air-transportation industry. Therefore, in the interest of efficiency, uniformity and national defense, I plead with you to restore the Federal funds for the maintenance and operation of the air-control towers in the airports throughout this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, 2½ minutes is wholly inadequate to discuss this subject. I think it might be brought out for the benefit of the subcommittee that while it did not place this item in the bill last year in the Seventy-ninth Congress, the House overwhelmingly instructed the committee to reinsert the item in the bill, by a very large vote.

Immediately upon the convening of this Congress the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce took up the subject of air safety, and it has been in almost continuous session morning and afternoon since January 15, very largely on that subject. There is much more involved in safety in air navigation than merely control towers. There is the proper equipment of the various airways,

there is airport zone control, there is airways traffic control—there is a myriad of subjects involved. We are doing our best, and we will come up with a report one of these days which we think will be a correct report, and not something just put together slap-dash in a few days of hearings.

In the meantime, I think it is going to be quite evident that it will be necessary to support all of the control towers in the United States whether the amount be \$5,000,000 or \$15,000,000. The question is how to pay for it. The reason why that is a big question is, as the gentlemen from San Diego, Calif., and from Kansas City, Kans., pointed out, that some airports are used very extensively by the military, some are used very extensively by private fliers, some are used almost exclusively by the military, and some are used almost exclusively by the non-scheduled operators. To find a satisfactory basis for the payment of that sum for the airport control towers is a very difficult thing. You cannot charge it to the municipality. You are going to have to charge it to the users of the airports on some equitable basis, but you are going to have to have a determination made as to the amount the Government has to pay for the military and naval use. At long last those airport control towers and the airways and the facilities are all 100 percent for the benefit of the United States Government in the event of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSER].

Mr. SASSER. Mr. Chairman, anything that might be said now would have to be by way of repetition, but since this is such a glaring example of where a heedless cut affects not only the economy but the safety of our country, I am constrained to make a brief observation. Air traffic, probably more than any other traffic, needs all the safety devices and protection possible. Taking off and landing are the most hazardous parts of that traffic. The air-traffic control towers tie right into the landing and the taking off.

I hope this Congress, for the sake of saving a few dollars temporarily, will not imperil the traveling public on air lines. I received this morning from the chairman of the Baltimore City Aviation Commission a telegram protesting the cut and urging that the air-traffic control-tower program be continued.

Mr. Chairman, may I take this opportunity to extend to the Members of the House on both sides, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESSANDRO], who resigns tomorrow to take his seat a few days later as mayor of the city of Baltimore, an invitation to attend his inaugural ceremonies at the city hall in Baltimore at 11:30 on Tuesday next. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. D'ALESSANDRO] is an outstanding, energetic, capable, and beloved Member of the House. He leaves an enviable record here. Representative D'ALESSANDRO enjoys the complete confidence of his colleagues. I know I speak the feeling of all here when we wish him well as mayor of Baltimore.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE].

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, the Cole and Hébert amendments to the Rooney amendment seek to give equitable treatment to all air-traffic control towers which qualify and have been approved under the requirements of the CAA formula, including the Westchester County class 4 airport. I believe that they should all be treated equitably, both those on the March list submitted by the CAA to the committee, which list appears in the hearings, all of which are included in the Rooney amendment, and those which have since met CAA standards and are now qualified.

The Westchester County Airport is now qualified under the CAA standards and the air-traffic control tower at this airport is operated under the supervision and control of the CAA. The traffic in and out of this airport records 13,574 points, using the point method developed by the CAA, which almost doubles the minimum of 7,500 points per month required before CAA will take over operation of a control tower. While at the present time the CAA is operating the air-control tower at the Westchester County Airport, the cost of operation is being borne by Westchester County, which reimburses the CAA for the cost of its operation each month. It is not of course equitable or fair that this airport should have to pay for the operation of its air-traffic control tower when other qualified air-traffic control towers are operated at Government expense. The purpose of this amendment is to have this cost paid by the CAA to the same extent it is now paying the cost of operation of all other approved air towers.

The traffic at this airport, located as it is in the metropolitan area, is increasing by leaps and bounds and will continue to do so.

Had there been a control tower at this airport at the time the large Army bomber smashed into the Empire State Building last year the accident could have been avoided because, while the bomber could not land at LaGuardia Field due to weather conditions, the Westchester County Airport was clear. As a matter of fact many planes now land at the Westchester County Airport when due to weather conditions or fog they cannot land at LaGuardia Field.

I sincerely hope the Cole and Hébert amendments are adopted.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to continue for a year Federal operation of the control towers at the 148 designated airports. I wish the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has been investigating the whole matter of air safety and control, had been able to complete its study and bring before us a well-considered over-all plan for development of airports, coordination of air traffic and

proper allocation of costs among the Federal Government, States or municipalities, and those who use the airports, such as military planes, commercial planes, and private planes.

The subcommittee reports that it will be able to complete its work and report out basic legislation in the next few months. Until we have enacted such legislation, I believe we must continue the present Federal support of the program as it has been developed by the Government during the war.

For instance, in my district is Wold Chamberlain Airport, which serves the Twin Cities and is already one of the busiest and most important in the country. As traffic to Asia expands, it should become the major port for air traffic to and from Alaska, Russia, and the Orient. Obviously, uniformity in signals and control is as essential for international air traffic as it is for sea navigation, lighthouses, and so forth. For Congress to reject the pending amendment would leave municipalities with the impossible task of making other arrangements in the 6 weeks between now and June 30, the end of the fiscal year. Some municipalities could take over the support of control towers; many could not. The net result would be disruption of the present efficient air-control system of the Nation. From the standpoint of our national defense alone, I cannot believe such action would be the part of wisdom or of economy, and I hope the amendment to continue the program for 1 year will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, 2½ minutes does not give one much time to talk on such an important matter, but I want to again call your attention to the testimony of Mr. T. P. Wright, Civil Aeronautics Administrator, found on page 627 of the hearings in which he says the following:

If you are talking of the reimbursement to the Government of one part of the expense, such as we are talking about under this general Federal airways program, that would be a possibility, if you could get all the cities to do it, but if one refused to do it, it seems to me you would be left without one link in your whole Federal airways system, and you simply could not fly airplanes into that airport under instrument weather conditions.

Mr. Chairman, I know a little something first-hand about this thing, because I flew 3 years as a pilot for the United States Army Air Forces, and I flew 3 years in civilian aircraft. I know what Mr. Wright says is true, because if you break that one link you have practically ruined your entire Federal airways system.

With this provision in this bill you are gambling with human lives. It is an expensive gamble. If you fail to adopt this amendment, you are going to be sacrificing human lives on the altar of petty politics and false economy. The amendment should be adopted. Any man who has ever tried to sweat an airplane in with a 200-foot ceiling to a field without a control tower knows that if we do not pass this amendment sooner or later we are going to have blood on our hands.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman means, I assume, that the amendment should be adopted with the proper figure inserted in it as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am certainly in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE]; if that is not adopted, then I am in favor of the Rooney amendment.

Mr. HÉBERT. But with the figures inserted in it, as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG].

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to one consideration that has not been brought out in this discussion. That is the question of the relation of national defense to this particular endeavor toward economy. Shall we allow the development of these CAA control towers to be done independently of each other and as a matter of municipal pride or political interest or financial ability, or shall we make it actually a matter of national concern? If so, we must provide national control and national confidence. I think unless the Rooney amendment is adopted we are crippling our Air Corps and the development of future members of the Air Corps, and that we would be doing something that I know the committee did not want to do; that is, crippling the national defense.

I call your attention very seriously to the fact that what we did last week, when we adopted an international position which has gone far beyond any we have adopted heretofore, should make us all the more careful that we think soberly in terms of the development of these new things which may help sustain our international position. In these I think the Air Corps is one which must be sustained and encouraged. I believe that every penny we can put in which will make the Air Corps a more valuable arm of our national economy, the better off we are and the better we safeguard our Nation's future.

Therefore, I recommend strongly that you support the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I agree that this Congress must of necessity drive toward economy in every possible way, but I do think economy in this kind of measure is unwise at this time.

Suppose you took a plane from the National Airport in Washington, and the city of Knoxville decided they did not want to maintain their control tower, or the city of Memphis did not; and you were going to Dallas, Fort Worth, San Antonio, or somewhere in the southern part of the Nation, and this plane lacked a control tower for landing at either of those two cities. Or

suppose on the other hand that they did have a control tower but it was operated by novices, without proper qualifications to operate it, because there is no necessity for a city to employ CAA qualified employees, nor those suggested or approved by the CAA. You just would not be safe in the air.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. These control towers will still continue to be operated by CAA personnel. It will be simply a question of reimbursement.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. But suppose a city refused to raise the money or could not raise the money, they would not be operated then by CAA, would they?

Now, it is not a new thing in the history of transportation for transportation facilities to be subsidized to a certain extent. In my State, where I have practiced law for 25 years, I have examined many abstracts during that time in which the State of Texas granted millions of acres of land to railroads. I do not have the figures but I am sure that billions of dollars have been granted to ship lines.

I favor the Rooney amendment to this bill as a necessary safety measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, when I had the floor some time ago, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], chairman of the subcommittee, asked me what made me think the funds which my amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] increased the Bakewell and Rooney amendments, would be used for the employment of those who operate control towers in our respective districts.

I wish to point out that the Bakewell substitute carries this proviso:

That \$4,948,484 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be available for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I gladly yield to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. In connection with the sum, the Bakewell amendment carries \$4,877,734. In conformity with arithmetic, as I explained—the amendment I offered and which the gentleman from Missouri has offered being really just a correction in arithmetic—I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment be changed to read \$4,948,484 in order to conform to the total amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana to modify his amendment as stated by the gentleman?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Gladly.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I offer this observation in order that we may know the

situation in the Committee at the present time? There is only one question before the Committee and that is the question of whether or not these funds will be restored which have been taken out by the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the cognizant committee.

The two amendments now before the Committee offered by the gentleman from Missouri and myself merely clarify or perfect the original amendment; in other words, they do not change the sense of the original amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL].

So it is quite necessary in supporting either the Rooney amendment or the Bakewell amendment that the two perfecting amendments offered by the gentleman from Missouri and by myself be supported also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, in my State, and I may bring it down to my district, and I am not embarrassed because I mention it, in Winston-Salem there is a large airport, a highly important one.

Under the laws of my State, the city of Winston-Salem cannot contribute to this expense. We would have to go back to the legislature and get authority to do it. The legislature adjourned months ago and will not reconvene for 2 years. It could not be included in the budget if the budget were to be made a week from now, or at any time, without legislative authority.

Mr. Chairman, I know the subcommittee is trying its best to do in every instance what is wise and required, but I do feel that the elimination of this support of safety for air travel is not justified at this time; indeed, I believe and state that in my opinion the position taken by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is the wise one; that finally the Government may have to get out of this, but when it does it ought to be at a time when the airways themselves can furnish this safety measure.

Let me say also before I take my seat that I favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] that White Plains, N. Y., and the two other airports, St. Joseph and New Orleans, be included, because these places have just recently been made eligible for this service, although there has not been time to go through the regular routine of having it approved by the Bureau of the Budget. I think they are entitled to come in also. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether there are many Members of Congress who have not received complaints in reference to

the elimination of funds for the operation of airport traffic control towers. One of the messages I received was from the mayor of the city of St. Louis in which he urged that funds for the operation of these towers be provided in the pending bill. I submitted the mayor's message to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, urging reconsideration of the committee's action. I also presented a copy to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], who has sponsored the amendment to provide for the continued operation of the control towers by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

To my mind this amendment is vital to the safety of everyone who flies in airplanes. The air-traffic control towers are lighthouses of the air, directing operations of commercial aircraft. Those who operate the electronic equipment in these towers must be qualified and it stands to reason if the standards and requirements are prescribed by one agency it will go a long way to increase the factor of safety for air travelers.

Even the Appropriations Committee recognizes the desirability of a central authority, but, in an effort to save a small sum, wrote into the bill that no funds in the pending appropriation could be used for the employment of personnel in the operation of air traffic control towers. The intent of the committee is to shift the burden for the operation of control towers to the States, counties, municipalities, and other public authorities. Clearly it is the intent of the committee that qualified and trained CAA personnel be used to man these towers, but such a good intention would certainly be a poor defense for the loss of one single life in a landing accident.

Within the past few months a number of airplane crashes have occurred. This Congress recognizing its responsibility provided funds for a study in this field.

A few years ago a study was made by a select committee of Congress of the causes of air accidents. This committee went into the matter thoroughly at that time and found that the inefficient operation of control towers by incompetent, and in many instances underpaid, municipal employees, was in part responsible for several serious accidents. The committee recommended to the House at that time that the operation of these towers be taken over by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It would certainly be inconsistent for this Congress to increase the hazards of flying by refusing to provide funds for the operation of these towers.

A parallel action would be to refuse appropriations for lighthouses which are scattered along the coast and require coastal cities to support them. I believe most of us realize the necessity for uniformity in the operation of lighthouses.

The control tower at the St. Louis municipal airport, which serves my district, is a part of the pattern of the control-tower system which links together the major airports in the United States. The control tower at St. Louis is perhaps just as important to Chicago, Los Angeles, or New York as it is to the St. Louis air-

port. Transcontinental flying cannot be carried on without this air-control-tower pattern.

I believe it has been clearly shown that uniformity of operation cannot be achieved if a hundred different cities are to employ, train, and direct the employees of these towers.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, who is a member of the committee, will continue the present uniform operation. I think we will make a serious mistake if this amendment is not adopted.

For one, I certainly do not want to take the responsibility of voting against it. The funds asked for are nothing as compared to the loss of one life.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Rooney amendment as well as the perfecting amendments thereto. Coming from the west coast, I have opportunity, of course, to see the essential necessities for safety in air traffic. My district is as far away from Washington as perhaps any other district in the Union, being some 3,000 miles from Washington to Portland where we have a very fine, large airport. Air traffic is essential to our national economy, and its safety is of utmost importance.

We have all been cognizant in the last year of the necessity for air-traffic safety controls. We have witnessed a number of deplorable air accidents in the last year which calls to our attention that we must perfect every mechanical device and safety measure known to man in order to provide safety in the air. At best it is a hazardous undertaking to go three or four thousand miles through the air. In my opinion, it would be a great mistake at this time to dispense with any safety measures, such as these control towers, in an endeavor to save some expense. I am heartily in accord with saving every dollar we can in the operation of the Government, but until we perfect other arrangements whereby these control towers can be taken care of by non-Federal agencies and adequately manned it would be a very serious mistake to enact legislation that will prevent us from having this one particular safety device under Federal operation, which is so essential to air-traffic safety.

I therefore trust that my colleagues will support these amendments, which will assure the keeping the control towers under Federal control.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment to restore the appropriation for the operation of control towers at certain major airports, and the perfecting amendments thereto, because I believe that this web of airport towers is essential to the safety of air transportation. After all, they constitute the safety net under those who fly and if any part of that net is gone the efficiency of the whole net is affected and deteriorates until it may just as well not be there at all.

I do not know so very much about flying but I have learned that it does not make very much difference what the weather conditions are or what happens at take-off but you do want to know the conditions at the point of landing. Taking out any of these towers materially affects the landing of airplanes either at destination or in forced landings en route.

I, too, have received a protest from the people who manage the Oakland airport; the assistant port manager, Mr. Joseph G. Bastow, and the president of the port commissioners, Mr. LeRoy Goodrich, who administer that great establishment. I also have in mind other airports where we hope to have federally operated towers. These are Hayward Airport, in Alameda County, and Buchanan Airport, in Contra Costa County. Whereas, I, too, like the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] subscribe to true economy in Government, until perfecting arrangements as suggested by my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], are put into effect, it would be more than foolish to abandon in the name of false economy the present system that works so well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the responsibility for safety of the airways should, in my opinion, rest primarily with the Civil Aeronautics Authority. Without a question of a doubt a rigid, uniform system of traffic control throughout the country will go far toward improving the safety conditions under which military, commercial, and private pilots operate. I am not unmindful of the fact that the States and municipalities are in far better financial condition than is the Federal Treasury, and, for that reason, it seems to me that legislation should be brought before the Congress whereby the cost of this operation should be borne jointly on a co-operative basis. In the meantime, I am certain that the various subdivisions of government are not in a position to take over these control towers at the end of the present fiscal year, and, for that reason, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have received many wires in connection with this problem and, at this point, I should like to read a few of them:

CHEYENNE, WYO., May 8, 1947.

We are advised House committee eliminated appropriation for airport control towers. This will handicap Cheyenne Airport. We request your help in restoring if consistent.

JOHN J. MCINERNEY,
Mayor of Cheyenne.

CHEYENNE, WYO., May 14, 1947.

While am in entire accord with all moves to cut governmental expenditures am somewhat concerned as to effect of eliminating funds for control towers in CAA appropriation. Probably Cheyenne could support this essential activity itself but doubt that other fields in State could. If this function is to be terminated at the Federal level possibly we might be well advised to go about it more gradually to give other agencies time to prepare themselves to take up the work.

R. W. MARBLE.

CHEYENNE, WYO., May 14, 1947.

Attempted decrease in appropriation for CAA may result in stoppage of necessary installations of land and other safety devices at airports. Wyoming airports would be badly crippled by such stoppage.

WILLITS A. BREWSTER.

WHEATLAND, WYO., May 13, 1947.

We who are interested in aviation are very much opposed to any cut in CAA budget where it concerns radio, control towers, or safety. Understand hearing on budget today.

JOHN K. PHIFER.

DENVER, COLO., May 14, 1947.

Your assistance is respectfully requested to support legislation sponsored by Representative BAKEWELL to reinstate funds in CAA appropriation for fiscal '48 operation of traffic-control towers presently being operated by them. Tower operation is an integral and vital part of Federal airways system and discontinuance will greatly add to flying risk for commercial air-line operation. Majority of 148 cities now so served will be unable to support the operation thereof with their own funds. Control-tower function also important aid and being fully utilized by armed forces and individual fliers.

G. G. BROODER,

Assistant to President, Western Airlines, Inc.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am delighted to hear the gentleman from Wyoming speak in support of the Rooney amendment. I intended to do the same thing for practically the same reasons as the gentleman from Wyoming as well as many other Members here have mentioned. I hope the amendment will carry as it did last year by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman for his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all of us about a month ago read about the accident of a commercial and a private plane somewhere in Georgia, 30 feet off the landing field. The report showed that the accident, in which some twenty-odd lives were lost, was occasioned by reason of the lack of a control tower. Just visualize these 140 key airports where we have control towers, if any substantial number of them should not be operated, the number of fatal accidents that we would have. Certainly, the life of one good citizen is worth the amount of this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to settle once and for all this argument about who is going to operate these control towers. As far as I am concerned, I think that they ought to be operated by the Civil Aeronautics Authority this year and in the years to come, and particularly for these two reasons: Now, and in the future, these 140 key airports of the Nation are going to be used by Army and Navy planes, planes of the armed services, and of the Government. In the second place, if we follow a sensible defense plan, we must have a good air corps, and a mobile air corps. We must have an air corps that can operate on the various air routes across this country and be ready to repel any attack upon us in a minute's notice. Certainly these key airports and control towers, operated by

proper personnel, play a very important part in our defense plans.

A third point is that in these days when we are learning more about radar, about electronics, and about methods of guiding planes in for landings under unfavorable situations, we ought to have a standard personnel, a personnel that is responsible to a central organization.

It is definitely in the public interest to have standard rules of operation promulgated by CAA, and it is also in the public interest to have personnel especially trained by the CAA to carry out the standard navigation rules. That being the case, I think the personnel should also be paid by the CAA. We all know that it is difficult to serve two masters. If the cities and municipalities are to pay the salaries of these operators, CAA will be without any effective means of seeing that they perform their work adequately and properly. Suppose the personnel were negligent in operating a control tower, the CAA, under this set-up, would have no power to discharge the negligent employee. This kind of situation would lead to confusion, to unsafe traveling conditions, and it should not be permitted. I hope the amendment is not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment and the amendment to the amendment. I do not think we can justify economy in this instance. We are dealing with one of the fastest growing industries in the world and we are beginning to try to economize on it. The receipts from taxes levied on air traffic are growing each year, yet we want to economize on these increasing receipts. When an airplane comes into a local airport out of the skies, it often proceeds to tank up with gasoline. It pays a Federal tax of 1 cent per gallon on the gasoline. If an airplane takes on 1,000 gallons it pays \$10 in taxes. If it takes on 1,500 gallons it pays \$15 in taxes. It takes off from that field, having been serviced there, and having paid a Federal tax upon the gasoline consumed. I do not think you can justify economies in a growing industry such as this when we levy a heavy tax upon it. I do not think you can justify economy when our tax receipts out of this industry are increasing. Surely, Mr. Chairman, if we consider as we did several months ago the tragic accidents we learned about over the radio and from the newspapers morning after morning, we must realize it is false economy to make a cut in this particular industry at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment increasing these funds and I am also in favor of the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, to begin with, we have no business at all considering any proposition to eliminate these funds. It is as much out of order as a hockey game in South Carolina in July. Unless and until the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brings in

legislation for the elimination of these airports, I think the Appropriations Committee is taking an awful lot for granted.

I am one who favors States' rights, but I would not go so far as my friend from Virginia. He wants the States to take over interstate commerce. I say to you that this is interstate commerce, pure and simple. This is our baby. We gave birth to this baby, and it is very, very unfitting at this time for us to repudiate this baby or deny its parentage. I say to you, we cannot destroy this little baby and leave him or her on the doorstep of the municipalities now because we have an economy axe with two blades on it. We cannot do that. We must take care of this baby until he or she gets to the point that he or she can fly. To shear off her wings at this time when she is a fledgling would be not only an asininity but would border on criminal negligence.

My good friend from Mississippi very aptly brought to the attention of the Members how one sweats out—literally sweats out—an airplane. It is very difficult when one gets over an airport and wants to land and there is no control tower. How would you feel if there were Congressmen in that plane? I know that if I were in that group I would not feel very good about it.

I say to my good friend, and I do not believe he was serious when he said that this was a pork-barrel proposition, that this is a pork barrel—this is slaughter all right, but not pork-barrel slaughter; it is the slaughter of the American people. When such a thing as that is involved it comes under the head of being our business, and it is our business particularly if it is interstate commerce.

We can ill afford to wipe out this appropriation because, God knows, we need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I am for the restoration of the item in this bill to cover the expenses of operating control towers.

It seems to me that pretty nearly everything has been said that can be said. I am for the Cole amendment and the Bakewell substitute amendment. Everyone knows that I am for economy, but this certainly has been a demonstration of how badly we need substantive legislation and a pattern which I trust the appropriate committee will soon bring to the Congress so that we can take the necessary and appropriate action.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma said that about everything has been said in support of this amendment that can be said.

I am one of those who always tries to go along with the Committee on Appropriations in solving these problems. I know that the gentleman from Nebraska has just as much interest in the support of the airport program as I have because I have worked with him on airport programs for many years. I think

it is unfortunate that it has to come back to us here again this year with the control towers eliminated when we had the same problem up a year ago. It is very heartening for me to know that the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are going to try very early to work out a program whereby we can work this program out on an over-all national basis.

All of us know who have traveled in all parts of the world how important this matter is to every individual. We also know at the present time on the basis of the record that has been made by the Air Transport Command Service during the war that these towers cannot be eliminated with safety. I think that probably by next year, with the Appropriations Committee taking this position, it is going to bring the matter to a head.

I expect to support this amendment because of the fact that this is a young industry and I think we owe it to it to support it at the present time. We should not abolish these 138 control towers throughout the country, because if we do nothing else but support those, we are throughout the country, because if we will be in the interest of the people of the entire country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

BUSINESS NEEDS ACCURATE INFORMATION TO PREVENT POSTWAR COLLAPSE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

I want to make a few remarks, which have occurred to me, about the work of the Department of Commerce generally, and what seems to me to be a peculiarly benighted view of the Department's functions that has been taken in the report of the Appropriations Committee.

I refer specifically to the suggestion made by the committee that the Department is nursing business. As a matter of fact I am informed that only \$11,675,000, or 4 percent, of the Department's appropriation has been requested for general services to business through the offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Now, we all know that American business does not need nursing, and I have enough confidence in Secretary Harri-man to believe him when he says he knows that business does not want to be molly coddled. I know he has no intention of trying to spoon-feed business with a lot of pap. And I know that he is not naive enough to believe that he can discharge the duties of his office—to do all that can be done to promote the welfare of American industry and commerce—by the simple expedient of warming up a nursing bottle.

The Department of Commerce is the greatest statistical agency in the Government. Its functions were designed to

meet specific business needs, for it is a fundamental truth that business and commerce may not long prosper unless the businessman has available in usable form reliable facts and statistics to enable him to cope intelligently with such problems as management, finance, investment, production, raw materials, labor, transportation, and distribution.

Now this is not news, I am sure, to the American businessman. But it is news, apparently, to some of the members of the Appropriations Committee. And I think it is important now to call attention to this lack of foresight.

It is true that a few generations ago the American businessman got along, and he got along very well, without having to bother very much about business statistics other than the most elementary type. In the simple, agrarian economy of those days statistics were not of major importance. But the businessmen of those days also got along, and they did very well, without telephones, without electric generators, without railroads, without accounting machines, and without combustion engines.

I maintain that it does not require any great imagination to understand that the supply of rubber originating in the southwest Pacific and controlled in London may greatly affect the affairs of manufacturers say in East St. Louis, Alton, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Belleville, Granite City, and Toledo; of assemblers in Chicago; and of dealers in all of our great cities. Similar examples could be cited to show the high degree of interdependence that characterizes our present economy.

It also seems obvious to me that modern businessmen and industrialists cannot operate efficiently unless they have a great body of reliable and easily accessible statistical information upon which they can base their actions. In our free-enterprise system this is particularly true. It is not enough for our Government to have this information, our businessmen must have it, too.

We can no more expect our businessmen to carry out successful enterprises and make intelligent decisions without adequate information than we can expect them to compete successfully in the modern world if we take away from them all modern means of communication, force them to use the horse and buggy, and to do their bookkeeping with a quill pen.

I submit that in this competitive, modern age it is not too much for the Department of Commerce to spend, as they have asked to do, \$11,675,000 for general services to business, to help the businessman get the economic and statistical information he needs in his battle to survive.

This is especially true at a time like the present, when, after a period of wartime-necessitated control and regulation by government, we are reverting to our free-market economy. Many areas of our economy are still characterized by distorted supply-demand and price-cost relationships. In light of the recency of Government decontrol and present inflationary pressures, there has probably never been a period when business has had more need for information as a basis

of forming sound policy and taking wise business action designed to prevent possible postwar collapse.

The dissemination of information vital to business should be strengthened and encouraged, not stricken down. To refer to programs of this type as "nursing business" seems to me to reveal a fundamental lack of understanding of a basic need. To curtail these appropriations, as has been proposed by the committee, is a step backward into the candlelight and horse-and-buggy era of our forebears.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment which seeks to restore certain funds to continue the tower-control service now rendered at Federal expense through the CAB.

Los Angeles airports handle one of the largest loads of any similar area in the United States. The safety of civilians and military personnel is involved in this unwarranted cut in funds. Unless these funds are restored, in my opinion, there will occur a great increase in airplane accidents and a decrease in air travel.

Our civic bodies are alarmed about this matter and have with telegrams and letters asked that this amount be restored.

I read at this point a telegram of great importance:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 13, 1947.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

We are gravely shocked to learn that the appropriation of funds for the operation of CAA air-traffic control towers may be discontinued in July. One of the greatest contributions to the increased safety of air transportation has been the efficient and uniform manner in which traffic-control towers have been operated by the CAA. The continuation of such a policy is not only justified on the basis of public safety but on the basis of national defense. To abandon this well-established program of uniform control over so vital a phase of the air-transport industry would constitute a grievous error in judgment at this time. It would jeopardize the lives of thousands of air travelers, millions of dollars' worth of equipment, and emasculate a well-established, smooth, and efficiently running program which is absolutely essential to our national defense. Accordingly we urgently request that you register immediate and vigorous protest to any deletion of funds from the CAA air-traffic-control program.

ROBERT L. SMITH,
President, Board of Airport Commissioners.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rooney amendment. Certainly at this time in our history we should do nothing that in any way impairs or impedes the continued growth and development of aviation.

All of us know that the aviation industry could not operate satisfactorily or safely without efficient control-tower assistance. I believe that it could be said that there is no other one element which is so important to safety in aviation as that which has to do with control-tower operations.

The suggestion that the municipalities, counties, and States take care of this problem is, in my opinion, impractical and unrealistic. I also feel that it is a failure on the part of the Federal Government to recognize its right and duty under the Constitution to govern and control interstate commerce. It is obvious that if each locality and municipality handled the control-tower operations at its own local airport there would be varying degrees and differing methods of operating these control towers. The result would be that a pilot, charged with the responsibility of safely transporting human lives in an airplane, would find it extremely difficult to remember the differing procedures and regulations established by each local community governing its airport.

Those of us who have attempted to drive from our homes to the Nation's Capital find it extremely difficult to go through an unfamiliar town where the stop lights are situated in positions unlike those in our own home town. Frequently we run by them, not knowing just exactly whether they are situated every other block or whether they are going to be in the center of the street or off to the side. However, in an automobile we can always stop and inquire when we are at a loss as to just what to do. Such is not the case in an airplane moving at around 200 miles an hour.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I should like to read from Time magazine of May 5 an article which illustrates more graphically than I could ever say, the obvious need for continued Federal supervision of control-tower operations:

Over Georgia's Muscogee County Airport, 9 miles northeast of Columbus, a twin-engine plane circled and headed in for a landing. At the controls sat Delta Air Lines' operations vice president, George R. Cushing, 48, a veteran pilot. Cushing and seven other Delta men (including Legal Adviser Lindley W. Camp, 52, long-time political crony of the late Gene Talmadge) were inspecting a network of newly acquired Georgia-Texas routes.

But the Delta plane was not alone in the sunny morning sky over the field. In for a landing, too, came a small private plane, piloted by a Columbus beer dealer, Joseph C. Fussell, 42. Before either pilot saw the other, or had time to do anything about it, the small plane dove at right angles into the big one's tail. Only 30 feet off the ground, the two planes bucked up like broncos, then crashed together onto runway No. 5, burst into bright flame. Everyone in both planes was killed.

It was the first major United States airline crash in 14 weeks, and Delta's first since 1935. What accounted for it? The reason was shockingly obvious: the Muscogee County Airport, like some 300 other United States airports regularly used by commercial aircraft, has no control tower to regulate landings. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has barely enough funds to operate towers at 117 of the Nation's larger airports (minimum annual cost, \$15,000 each). The Georgia crash might help get additional funds from Congress to operate more.

The lives of many of our citizens will be greatly endangered if the Federal Government fails to appropriate the money for these control-tower operators. I, for one, do not want to ride in an airplane which is going to land at several different cities en route to my destination, if one city has a traffic pattern working from the left around an airport, and another city has a traffic pattern working from the right; or where the signs and signals have different meanings. Particularly would I not want to travel by air if there was bad weather prevailing.

For this Congress to fail to appropriate money to keep the control-tower operations uniform and efficient throughout the country constitutes a flagrant failure of this Congress to recognize and perform its duty. To say that this is necessary under the name of economy is merely to prove that we are penny-wise and pound-foolish.

One other thought before my time is up. This country has developed in direct relationship to the progress and development of our transportation system. After the Civil War the railroad train became a practical and useful instrument of transportation. It was the railroads which bound our Nation together once again, permitted the development of our great reservoir of natural resources, and put this country back on its feet industrially and financially. After the First World War when the economy of the country was stagnated by reason of the war, it was the automobile industry which reinvigorated our national economy and started its wheels to turning productively again.

Now that World War II is over, we are trying to reconvert from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy, and we find that the wheels of the peacetime economy are somewhat rusty and difficult to get started. I am confident that an expanding aviation industry will do more to reinvigorate and reenliven our peacetime economy than will any other element. It will be to us after World War II what the automobile was after World War I and the railroad after the Civil War.

We should not be so shortsighted as to make the mistake of trying to economize on this, the most essential and important factor in aviation, and by so doing shackle the growth and development of aviation at a time when its growth is essential to our economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take very much of the Committee's time at this point. I think everybody has made up his mind in regard to the amendments now on the Clerk's desk. I shall accept the amendment to my amendment increasing the sum of \$70,982,000 to \$71,081,484 and urge the House to vote for it. However, I shall oppose the Bakewell substitute for my amendment and ask that it be voted down. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], a member of the committee, for 5 minutes, to close debate.

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about safety involved in this amendment. In other words, the proponents of the Rooney amendment and the supporters of it would have blood dripping from the hands of the majority members of the subcommittee for eliminating the operation and maintenance of airport control towers. So that the record will be straight, I invite you to turn to page 802, where the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] asked this:

Mr. STEFAN. Last year when we went into this item of towers, there was something said about safety. Would the element of safety enter into the operation of these towers if the salaries of these CAA employees were reimbursed to the CAA by the individual municipalities?

Mr. KLEIN—

Mr. Klein who is an experienced flier, who is a member of the CAA staff, who has the responsibility of safety of air transportation and air private flying, said this—

No, sir. It would not affect the operation. As you know, we already operate many towers that way. We are still operating, I believe, about six towers with funds provided by the municipalities.

Now, let us just remove the demagoguery from the argument against the action of the committee. There is no safety factor involved. Let us take away all impassioned pleas about safety and get down to basic facts. Safety is not involved. The question involved is this: With a \$259,000,000 Federal debt, shall the States and municipalities assume some of the responsibility for this growing industry? There are presently 4,700 airports in the United States. In the projected future it is planned to have 6,300. On the basis of the facts shown on page 796 of the hearings, the average cost of operating these control towers is \$32,000 each. This item will grow to an appropriation of \$201,000,000 a year, for 6,300 airports, and that is not in the distant future.

You can talk all you want to about cutting the Federal budget, but you can see that with \$201,000,000 annually charged to the Federal Government for this type of growing function started only last year that we never can balance the budget unless States and municipalities assume their fair share of responsibility.

The States and the municipalities should carry some of the responsibility.

I know you are all ready to roll the committee. The answer is obvious. On pages 797 and 798 of the hearings is a list of the airports where this \$4,800,000 will be used for salaries of operation and maintenance personnel.

How many Congressmen are represented by those airports? I have a list of them. This morning I figured out there are over 200 Members representing districts in which those airports are located. I can understand how people from farm districts can go back home and say: "Oh, yes; we cut Labor and Federal Security appropriations." I can understand how people from the Midwest will say: "We were against the Greek-Turkish loan, but people from other areas broke down the economy program." I can understand how easy the

people from the cities would be able to economize on the Agriculture appropriation bill. I can understand how easy the gentleman from New York, the author of the pending amendment, can cut out all of the Grazing Service and make his economy record; but the real test of our economy is the courage we have to cut the waste and assume the local responsibility for Federal Government services in our own districts. Mr. Chairman, we all owe a responsibility to cut Federal ex-

penditures in our own districts. We can butcher up the sacred cow of the other fellow, but when it comes to cleaning up our own front doorstep, will we fail?

I insert in the RECORD the names of Congressmen whose districts are affected by the Rooney amendment. You will notice many of the proponents of the Rooney amendment in the debate this afternoon are in the list of Congressmen who have 1 of the 149 airports in their district where the Rooney amend-

ment money would be spent. In fairness I must say that some Members will vote against the Rooney amendment who have some of this list of 149 airports in their district. My hat is off to this group of economy Congressmen. The following is a list of 130 airports of the Federal control system and then the 19 to be added in the fiscal year 1948 if the Rooney amendment is adopted, with the Congressman's name in whose district they are located and party affiliation:

Established airport-traffic control towers (total, 130)

City	Republican	Democrat
Ahile, Tex.		Omar Burleson (17).
Akron, Ohio		Walter B. Huber (14).
Albany, N. Y.		William T. Byrne (32).
Albuquerque, N. Mex.		Antonio M. Fernandez (at large).
Do.		Georgia Lee Lusk (at large).
Amarillo, Tex.		Eugene Worley (18).
Anchorage, Alaska		E. L. Bartlett.
Anette, Alaska		Do.
Atlanta, Ga.		James Curran Davis (5).
Augusta, Ga.		Paul Brown (10).
Austin, Tex.		Lyndon B. Johnson (10).
Bakersfield, Calif.		A. J. Elliott (10).
Baltimore, Md.		Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr. (3).
Do.		George H. Fallon (4).
Bangor, Maine	Frank Fellows (3).	
Big Spring, Tex.		George H. Mahon (19).
Bismarck, N. Dak.	Charles R. Robertson (at large).	
Do.	William Lemke (at large).	
Billings, Mont.	Wesley A. D'Ewart (2).	
Birmingham, Ala.	John Sanborn (2).	Laurie Calvin Battle (6).
Boise, Idaho	Christian A. Horter (10).	John W. McCormack (12).
Boston, Mass.	Richard B. Wigglesworth (13).	John F. Kennedy (11).
Do.	John Davis Lodge (4).	
Bridgeport, Conn.	Dayton E. Phillips (1).	
Bristol, Tenn.		Milton West (15).
Brownsville, Tex.	Walter G. Andrews (42).	
Buffalo, N. Y.	Edward J. Elsassner (43).	
Do.	John C. Butler (14).	
Do.		
Burbank, Calif. (same as for Los Angeles)	Charles A. Plumley (at large).	
Burlington, Vt.		
Charleston, S. C.	Frank Barrett (at large).	L. Mendel Rivers (1).
Charlotte, N. C.		Hamilton C. Jones (10).
Cheyenne, Wyo.		
Chattanooga, Tenn.		Estes Kefauver (3).
Chicago, Ill.	William G. Stratton (at large).	
Do.	Richard B. Vail (2).	William L. Dawson (1).
Do.	Fred E. Busbey (3).	Martin Gorski (4).
Do.	Thomas L. Owens (7).	Adolph J. Sabath (5).
Do.	Robert J. Twyman (9).	Thomas J. O'Brien (6).
Do.	Ralph E. Church (10).	Thomas S. Gordon (8).
Cincinnati, Ohio	George H. Bender (at large).	
Do.	Charles H. Elston (1).	
Do.	William E. Hess (2).	
Cleveland, Ohio	George H. Bender (at large).	Michael A. Feighan (20).
Do.	Frances P. Bolton (22).	Robert Crosser (21).
Columbia, S. C.		John J. Riley (2).
Columbus, Ohio	George H. Bender (at large).	
Do.	John M. Vorys (12).	
Corpus Christi, Tex.		John E. Lyle (14).
Covington, Ky.		Brent Spence (5).
Dallas, Tex.		Frank Wilson (5).
Dayton, Ohio	George H. Bender (at large).	
Do.	Raymond H. Burke (3).	
Des Moines, Iowa	Paul Cunningham (5).	
Denver, Colo.	John A. Carroll (1).	
Detroit, Mich.	George G. Sadowski (1).	
El Paso, Tex.		Ewing Thomasson (16).
Evansville, Ind.	Edward A. Mitchell (8).	
Fairbanks, Alaska		E. L. Bartlett.
Fargo, N. Dak. (same as Bismarck)		
Flint, Mich.	William W. Blackney (6).	
Fort Wayne, Ind.	George W. Gille (4).	
Fort Worth, Tex.		Wingate Lucas (12).
Fresno, Calif.	Bertrand W. Gearhart (9).	
Grand Rapids, Mich.	Bartel J. Jonkman (5).	
Great Falls, Mont.	Wesley Abner D'Ewart (2).	
Greensboro, N. C.		Carl Thos. Durham (6).
Harrisburg, Pa.	John C. Kunkel (18).	
Hartford, Conn.	William J. Miller (1).	
Helena, Mont.		Michael J. Mansfield (1).
Honolulu, T. H.	Joseph R. Farrington.	
Houston, Tex.		Albert Thomas (8).
Indianapolis, Ind.		Louis L. Ludlow (11).
Jackson, Miss.		John B. Williams (7).
Jacksonville, Fla.		Emory H. Price (2).
Juneau, Alaska		E. L. Bartlett.
Kansas City, Mo.		Charles J. Bell (4).
Kansas City, Kans.	Errett P. Scrivner (2).	
Knoxville, Tenn.	John Jennings, Jr. (2).	
Las Vegas, Nev.	Charles H. Russell (at large).	
Little Rock, Ark.		Brooks Hay (5).
Long Beach, Calif.	Willis W. Bradley (18).	
Louisville, Ky.	Thurston B. Morton (3).	
Los Angeles, Calif.	Richard M. Nixon (12).	Helen Gahagan Douglas (14).
Do.	Norris Poulson (13).	Cecil R. King (17).
Do.	Gordon L. McDonough (15).	Chet Holifield (19).
Do.	Donald L. Jackson (16).	Harry R. Sheppard (21).
Do.	Willis W. Bradley (18).	
Do.	Carl Hinshaw (20).	

Established airport-traffic control towers (total, 130)—Continued

City	Republican	Democrat
Lynchburg, Va.		James L. Almond, Jr. (6).
Medford, Oreg.	Harris Ellsworth (4).	
Memphis, Tenn.		Clifford Davis (10).
Miami, Fla.		George A. Smathers (4).
Milwaukee, Wis.	Charles J. Kersten (5).	
Do.	John C. Brophy (4).	
Minneapolis, Minn.	Walter H. Judd (5).	
Mobile, Ala.		Frank W. Boykin (1).
Nashville, Tenn.		J. Percy Priest (6).
Newark, N. J.	Fred A. Hartley, Jr. (10).	
Do.	Frank L. Sundstrom (11).	
Do.	Robert W. Kean (12).	
New Orleans, La.		F. Edward Hébert (1).
Do.		Hale Boggs (2).
New York (Floyd Bennett and LaGuardia).	W. Kingsland Macy (1).	John J. Delaney (7).
Do.	Leonard W. Hall (2).	Joseph L. Pfeiler (8).
Do.	Henry J. Latham (3).	Eugene J. Keogh (9).
Do.	Gregory McMahon (4).	Andrew L. Somers (10).
Do.	Robert Tripp Ross (5).	James J. Heffernan (11).
Do.	Robert Nodar, Jr. (6).	John J. Rooney (12).
Do.	Ellsworth B. Buck (16).	Donald L. O'Toole (13).
Do.	Frederic R. Coudert, Jr. (17).	Leo F. Rayfield (14).
Do.		Emanuel Celler (15).
Do.	Vito Marcantonio, American Labor Party (18).	
Do.	Jacob K. Javits (21).	Arthur G. Klein (19).
Do.	David M. Potts (26).	Sol Bloom (20).
Do.		Adam C. Powell, Jr. (22).
Do.		Walter A. Lynch (23).
Do.		Benjamin J. Rabin (24).
Do.		Charles A. Buckley (25).
Do.		Porter Hardy, Jr. (2).
Do.		George P. Miller (6).
Do.		A. S. Monroney (6).
Norfolk, Va.		Joe Hendrick (5).
Oakland, Calif.	John J. Allen, Jr. (7).	
Oklahoma City, Okla.		
Omaha, Nebr.	Howard H. Buffett (2).	
Orlando, Fla.		
Palm Springs, Calif.	John Phillips (22).	
Pendleton, Oreg.	Lowell Stockman (2).	
Philadelphia, Pa.	James Gallagher (1).	
Do.	Robert N. McGarvey (2).	
Do.	Hardie Scott (3).	
Do.	F. J. Maloney (4).	
Do.	George W. Sarbacher, Jr. (5).	
Do.	Hugh D. Scott, Jr. (6).	
Phoenix, Ariz.		Richard F. Harless (at large).
Do.		John R. Murdock (at large).
Pittsburgh, Pa.	John McDowell (29).	Herman P. Eberharter (32).
Do.	Robert J. Corbett (30).	Frank Buchanan (33).
Do.	James J. Fulton (31).	
Portland, Maine.	Robert Hale (1).	
Portland, Oreg.	Homer D. Angell (3).	
Presque Isle, Maine.	Frank Fellows (3).	
Providence, R. I.		
Do.		Aime J. Forand (1).
Raleigh, N. C.		John E. Fogarty (2).
Red Bluff, Calif.		Harold D. Cockey (4).
Richmond, Va.		Clair Engle (2).
Roanoke, Va.		J. Vaughan Gary (3).
Rochester, Minn.	August H. Andresen (1).	James L. Almond (6).
Rochester, N. Y.	Kenneth B. Keating (40).	
Sacramento, Calif.	Leroy Johnson (3).	
Salt Lake City, Utah.	William A. Dawson (2).	
San Antonio, Tex.		Paul J. Kilday (20).
San Diego, Calif.	Chas. K. Fletcher (23).	
San Francisco, Calif.	Richard J. Welch (5).	Frank R. Havenner (4).
Santa Barbara, Calif.	Ernest King Bramblett (11).	
Savannah, Ga.		Prince H. Preston, Jr. (1).
Seattle, Wash.	Homer R. Jones (1).	
Shreveport, La.		Overton Brooks (4).
Sioux City, Iowa.	Chas. B. Hoeven (8).	
South Bend, Ind.	Robert A. Grant (3).	
Spokane, Wash.	Walt Horan (5).	
St. Louis, Mo.	Claude I. Bakewell (11).	Frank M. Karsten (13).
Do.	Walter C. Ploeser (12).	
Spartansburg, S. C.		Joseph R. Bryson (4).
Syracuse, N. Y.	R. Walter Riehlman (36).	
Tallahassee, Fla.		Robert L. F. Sikes (3).
Tampa, Fla.		James H. Peterson (1).
Toledo, Ohio.	Homer A. Ramey (9).	
Topeka, Kans.	Albert M. Cole (1).	
Tucson, Ariz. (same as Phoenix).		
Tulsa, Okla.	George B. Schwabe (1).	
Washington, D. C.		
West Palm Beach, Fla.		Dwight L. Rogers (6).
Wichita, Kans.	Edward H. Rees (4).	
Winstow, Ariz. (same as Phoenix).		
Winston-Salem, N. C.		John H. Folger (5).
Yakima, Wash.	Hal Holmes (4).	
Yakutat, Alaska.		F. L. Bartlett.
Youngstown, Ohio.		Michael J. Kirwan (19).

New towers to be established in fiscal year 1948 (total, 19)

City	Republican	Democrat
Baton Rouge, La.		James H. Morrison (6).
Battle Creek, Mich.	Paul W. Shafer (3).	
Chicago, Ill. (see list above)		Joe Hendricks (5).
Daytona Beach, Fla.		John A. Blatnik (8).
Duluth, Minn.		
Erie, Pa.	Carroll D. Kearns (28).	
Greenville, S. C.		Joseph R. Bryson (4).
Lansing, Mich.	William W. Blackney (6).	
Montgomery, Ala.		George McIlvaine Carr (2).

New towers to be established in fiscal year 1948 (total, 19)—Continued

City	Republican	Democrat
Niagara Falls, N. Y.	Walter G. Andrews (42)	
Ogden, Utah		Walter K. Granger (1).
Peoria, Ill.	Everett M. Dirksen (16)	
Pocatello, Idaho	John Sanborn (2)	
Reading, Pa.	Frederick A. Muhlenberg (13)	
Reno, Nev.	Charles H. Russell (at large)	
San Juan, P. R.		Antonio Fernós-Isern.
Texarkana, Tex.		Wright Patman (1).
Wichita Falls, Tex.		Ed Gossett (13).
Williamsport, Pa.	Robert F. Rich (15)	

Let us not get away from the basic question. The issue is not abolition of control-tower operation. The committee seeks to have the States assume the responsibility for operation of all of the control towers. The committee thinks they ought to do it and that they are able financially to relieve Uncle Sam of the burden of these annual fixed charges after the Federal Government has constructed them on the pressure of the local communities and the States by and large. The Federal Government has invested a cool \$100,000,000 in airports for the States. The interest charge on this much borrowed money—a part of the \$259,000,000 debt—is \$2,000,000 annually. The States and local subdivisions benefited do not pay one red cent of that. The Federal Government pays \$57,000 annually in rental charges for space for Federal workers to keep the planes flying. This \$57,000 annual rental is paid by the Federal Government for space in airports it built for the States and local subdivisions.

Now, let us look at the appropriations of the Federal Government in the 1947 and 1948 fiscal years for the aviation industry and private flying. These are fixed charges annually and not for airport construction:

	1947	1948
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	\$2,490,000	\$2,535,000
Civil Aeronautics Administration.....	79,038,120	87,007,000
Weather Bureau (for aviation only).....	3,000,000	3,300,000
Total.....	\$4,528,000	\$92,842,000

¹ With the Rooney amendment the 1948 fiscal year total would be \$4,800,000 more or a total of \$97,642,000.

With the Rooney amendment adopted the annual fixed charges paid to support aviation in the United States and its Territories will have increased \$13,000,000 in 1 year. This is the year by the way that we promised the electorate we would cut Federal expenditures. Have we forgotten that pledge made last fall?

All the committee asks the States and local subdivisions of the country is to pay the small sum to operate the control towers on airports they wanted built. How do the States stand on finances compared to the Federal Government. The States have a gross debt of \$2,500,000,000. The Federal Government has a debt of \$259,000,000,000. The average State debt per capita is \$18.50. The per capita Federal debt is \$1,800. Shame on us if we do not require the

several 48 States to carry the little portion of this annual fixed-charge burden.

I insert a list of the States with the gross debt, population, and the per capita debt for each in the following table:

State	Gross debt in thousands, end of 1945	Population, estimated July 1, 1945, excluding armed forces overseas	Per capita debt 1945
Alabama.....	65,769	2,812,301	\$23.90
Arizona.....	3,339	630,298	5.30
Arkansas.....	139,783	1,779,817	78.54
California.....	172,929	8,822,688	19.60
Colorado.....	18,284	1,120,595	16.29
Connecticut.....	23,600	1,709,232	13.81
Delaware.....	4,502	286,832	15.70
Florida.....	1,304	2,385,917	.55
Georgia.....	15,180	3,191,766	4.76
Idaho.....	519	500,109	1.04
Illinois.....	115,163	7,897,291	14.59
Indiana.....	6,408	3,427,796	1.87
Iowa.....	1,353	2,259,526	.60
Kansas.....	11,540	1,740,379	6.64
Kentucky.....	6,057	2,578,179	2.35
Louisiana.....	162,744	2,456,057	66.26
Maine.....	19,178	847,222	21.46
Maryland.....	38,459	2,125,419	18.09
Massachusetts.....	70,288	4,316,721	16.28
Michigan.....	16,086	5,256,106	3.06
Minnesota.....	75,084	2,497,485	30.06
Mississippi.....	72,508	2,080,377	34.85
Missouri.....	73,499	3,556,693	20.66
Montana.....	11,746	467,624	25.07
Nebraska.....	970	1,198,492	.81
Nevada.....	14,443	159,804	9.04
New Hampshire.....	76,109	491,624	29.38
New Jersey.....	22,998	4,160,165	\$18.29
New Mexico.....	22,998	535,220	42.97
New York.....	571,951	13,479,142	42.93
North Carolina.....	111,332	3,504,626	31.77
North Dakota.....	19,927	520,935	38.25
Ohio.....	10,870	6,907,012	1.57
Oklahoma.....	27,400	2,034,400	13.50
Oregon.....	20,332	1,206,322	16.87
Pennsylvania.....	178,041	9,900,180	19.56
Rhode Island.....	25,327	713,346	35.50
South Carolina.....	81,908	1,905,597	42.98
South Dakota.....	25,301	555,317	45.56
Tennessee.....	70,371	2,878,777	27.57
Texas.....	11,996	6,786,740	1.77
Utah.....	2,014	616,989	3.26
Vermont.....	3,374	359,231	9.39
Virginia.....	24,208	3,079,706	7.86
Washington.....	12,980	2,088,574	6.21
West Virginia.....	71,317	1,724,677	21.35
Wisconsin.....	3,943	3,137,587	1.26
Wyoming.....	3,194	246,766	13.94

Total State debt, \$2,524,737,000. Estimated 140,000,000 population equals \$18.03 per capita State debt. Estimated Federal debt March 1947, \$260,000,000,000. Estimated population, 140,000,000 equals \$1,857.14 per capita.

Bear in mind all of this debt does not accrue in the next year. A great portion of this debt I would assume was long-term indebtedness because most States have built up a surplus. While Uncle Sam spreads largess to the 48 States and spends himself to poverty the 48 States have been accumulating a huge surplus in their respective State treasuries to an aggregate total of \$2,896,506,000. In 1943 this surplus was only \$1,100,420,000 according to the Census Bureau. Is it not time for the States now to take on their fair share of responsibility?

I insert a table now showing the surplus by years by States for the years 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946:

TABLE 1.—Aggregate balances in State general, highway, and postwar reserve funds at end of fiscal year, by State: 1943-46

State	Amount (in thousands of dollars)			
	1946	1945	1944	1943
Total.....	2,896,506	2,274,612	1,677,346	1,100,420
Alabama.....	30,838	12,193	7,426	1,185
Arizona.....	11,488	7,460	8,704	6,793
Arkansas.....	12,094	9,830	7,053	4,428
California.....	490,655	61,252	257,894	136,727
Colorado.....	22,563	18,457	13,942	9,388
Connecticut.....	29,797	38,081	29,929	24,866
Delaware.....	13,766	10,862	8,434	5,798
Florida.....	38,408	26,338	20,158	10,413
Georgia.....	15,396	17,570	12,861	8,025
Idaho.....	10,567	6,156	4,580	2,561
Illinois.....	188,282	156,050	118,241	86,163
Indiana.....	89,83	70,976	62,646	55,382
Iowa.....	49,101	29,543	28,605	22,449
Kansas.....	27,419	28,479	26,669	22,561
Kentucky.....	25,681	17,775	15,988	15,072
Louisiana.....	7,260	24,693	17,759	11,502
Maine.....	9,143	11,564	8,962	8,418
Maryland.....	33,414	28,483	19,176	10,714
Massachusetts.....	13,016	28,161	19,685	13,029
Michigan.....	84,673	61,765	48,182	44,265
Minnesota.....	20,696	29,165	28,665	22,489
Mississippi.....	22,743	19,646	10,544	20,611
Missouri.....	62,801	34,403	28,121	19,278
Montana.....	9,286	8,796	8,674	5,685
Nebraska.....	10,512	9,947	9,613	7,305
Nevada.....	5,425	4,176	3,414	2,280
New Hampshire.....	6,800	4,901	4,494	4,051
New Jersey.....	42,022	53,197	32,311	5,491
New Mexico.....	7,483	6,168	6,129	5,325
New York.....	501,481	229,158	163,061	68,962
North Carolina.....	98,757	72,221	57,541	72,750
North Dakota.....	17,104	13,915	12,403	7,869
Ohio.....	162,773	125,147	105,113	81,277
Oklahoma.....	26,699	12,569	8,318	9,082
Oregon.....	58,470	41,841	33,687	28,909
Pennsylvania.....	180,672	169,695	143,552	78,012
Rhode Island.....	6,288	4,038	4,455	4,496
South Carolina.....	18,856	21,943	16,390	10,932
South Dakota.....	15,914	11,394	9,155	6,532
Tennessee.....	32,427	25,297	19,339	12,073
Texas.....	55,885	31,098	4,333	14,734
Utah.....	3,974	4,155	4,391	2,666
Vermont.....	8,100	8,264	6,981	5,150
Virginia.....	74,307	63,465	50,882	35,810
Washington.....	90,837	83,580	47,549	37,200
West Virginia.....	22,322	18,256	17,637	13,528
Wisconsin.....	93,558	71,912	58,754	39,057
Wyoming.....	8,530	6,575	4,377	2,575

Let us get economy from our own doorstep. Let the local and State governments pay this small \$4,800,000 which the Rooney amendment would have the Federal Government pay. Let us get the weighted cost of the \$92,842,000 allowed by the committee to service aviation annually from the air lines that is properly chargeable to them and put aviation on a sound basis in the United States. Aviation will not profit by the State and local governments, the commercial aviation industry chiseling Uncle Sam to bankruptcy. One by one let us remove the chiselers from Uncle Sam. Let us vote down the Rooney amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendments.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendments may be read before they are voted on so we may have the benefit of hearing them again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the Cole amendment to the Rooney amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Missouri to the amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: Strike out "\$70,982,000" and insert "\$71,081,484."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE] to the Rooney amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLE of Missouri and Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 141, noes 84.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Hébert amendment to the Bakewell substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HÉBERT to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. BAKEWELL: Strike out "\$71,045,734" and insert "\$71,081,484" and strike out "\$4,877,734" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,948,484."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Hébert amendment to the Bakewell substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HÉBERT) there were—ayes 82, noes 106.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HÉBERT and Mr. STEFAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 88, noes 122.

So the amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The Clerk will report the substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. BAKEWELL to the amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY:

Page 45, line 18, strike out "\$66,133,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$71,045,734."

And on page 45, line 23, strike out beginning with the word "That" down to and including the word "towers" on page 46, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That \$4,877,734 of the funds hereby appropriated shall be available for the employment of personnel for the operation of air-traffic control towers."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAKEWELL and Mr. FLOESER) there were—ayes 45, noes 113.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as amended.

The Clerk will report the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY as amended by the amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Missouri: On page 45, line 18, strike out "\$66,133,000" and insert "\$71,081,484"; and on page 45, line 23, strike out the proviso beginning with the word "That" and ending with the colon on page 46, line 1.

The question was taken; and, the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 179, noes 62.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the acquisition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of additional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the acquisition of the necessary sites by lease or grant; personal services in the District of Columbia; and hire of passenger motor vehicles; \$17,638,000, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1947 which is hereby merged with this appropriation: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$200,000 of this appropriation shall be available for emergency repair and replacement of facilities damaged by fire, flood, or storm, not to exceed \$125,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration," for necessary expenses in connection with the transportation by air to and from and within the Territories and possessions of the United States of materials and equipment secured under this appropriation, and not to exceed \$500,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration," for necessary administrative costs; and the War and Navy Departments are authorized during the fiscal year 1948, to transfer without charge, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, air navigation and communication facilities, including appurtenances thereto, to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 46, line 18, after the word "and," insert the words "purchase of 21 and."

Line 15, strike out "\$17,638,000" and insert "\$36,308,000."

On page 47, line 1, strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$910,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment concerns an item in the Department of Commerce section of this bill which is of the utmost importance to the people and to the security of our Nation. My amendment would increase the amount \$17,638,000 for establishment of air-navigation facilities allowed by the majority members of the

committee to the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget and Civil Aeronautics Administration; namely, \$36,308,000. The full amount \$36,308,000 is urgently needed to purchase and install equipment which is absolutely necessary to insure the safety of the American people using the air lines. It is particularly necessary, as you know, because of accidents caused by storms and bad weather. Allowance of the amount which my amendment provides will make air travel in this country safe for the people of America.

In this particular instance the committee cut the item for establishment of air-navigation facilities to the extent of more than 50 percent. Let us see what the committee's reduction of the item proposes to do. Their reduction means the elimination of 38 instrument landing systems. It means the elimination of 38 high-intensity approach lights. The allowance of only the sum of \$17,638,000 as provided in the bill in its present form means the complete elimination of 42 very high-frequency radio rangars. It means the complete elimination of all low-frequency high-powered omnidirectional radio ranges which have been planned by the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

It means a serious reduction in the program for the installation of ground-controlled approach radar which is so vitally necessary to the safety of aircraft in fog and in rain. It will require the reduction in plans for the installation of surveillance radar equipment which is used to prevent collisions in midair over the airports throughout our country.

Last year almost 13,000,000 Americans rode the air lines in the continental United States. Is it sensible economy to purchase that economy with the lives of a great many of the American public?

During the last quarter of a century we have invested approximately \$1,000,000,000 in aviation. We have invested more than \$10,000,000,000 in railroads, roads, and waterways. Our investments in railroads, roads, and waterways have all been fully repaid and proved to have been investments which were sensible and economical. So it is with reference to this item in this bill for establishment of air-navigation facilities. Two committees of this Congress, one the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the other the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate had this to say, after having held a number of hearings, after the serious air casualties were experienced by the air lines around the first of this year. I quote to you from a report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of this House, dated February 19, 1947:

It appears, however, that there has been a certain number of accidents recently which might have been prevented had certain facilities been available. * * * It is the committee's opinion that the Federal Government should provide certain facilities to increase air safety as soon as possible. * * * Your committee is encouraged to note the development of air aids to navigation, including aids to landing and take-offs that have been advanced in development during

the war, but is concerned by the delay in installation of such equipment caused by the war, and urges acceleration in the provision of the necessary funds so that these aids may be made fully available as soon as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Now let me quote from a report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, investigating safety in the air:

The members of the subcommittee stress the urgency of the installation of all possible navigational aids as far as feasible before the winter of 1947-48. It is recommended that the Civil Aeronautics Administration plan this present program for completion within a period not exceeding 18 months.

The majority members of this subcommittee and of the full Appropriations Committee have proceeded diametrically opposite to the contention of the House and Senate Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, when they cut an item such as the one to which this amendment refers, establishment of air navigation facilities, to the extent of \$13,670,000.

I respectfully ask your favorable consideration of this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the beginning of numerous amendments that will be offered to restore all of the budget figures in this bill, or most of them. The committee should be on notice that we made these cuts with the recommendation of experts who have gone into every phase of safety aids to air navigation. We are appropriating in this bill \$19,500,000 for CAA. If this particular item which the gentleman from New York seeks to increase is granted, they will have for expenditure this year \$19,622,000, of which they have spent only \$10,000,000. In other words, they have \$10,000,000 on hand and we are allowing them in this bill \$17,638,000. In other words, they will have \$26,688,000 on hand for next fiscal year. Of course, we threw out 21 new automobiles and a lot of water that was in the estimate.

I hope you will vote down this and other similar amendments.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. I wonder if the gentleman from New York would sponsor a bill appropriating the sums of money needed for the railroads of this country to restore the safety devices which have been depleted during the war.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I will say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the answer is "no."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to place the committee on notice again that we are just as much interested as any one of you in safety in air navigation. The amendment to eliminate the control towers was a test, because somewhere along the line we have got to get private industry, the cities, the municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government to cooperate in the matter of control towers that are needed by more airports not now provided for.

We have gone into every detail of the CAA. We know something about GCA, ILS, and the rest of the new safety aids. I do not know whether ILS and GCA are perfect or what new is coming. The experts say that ILS is not perfect. Experts tell us we have appropriated too much for GCA. But we do not want the CAA to come here and tell you that we are taking any aids away from them. We want them to have every one they want to make air navigation safe. We have provided for all phases of safety.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is the first of a number that are to be offered to restore every penny the Administration has asked.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Assuming that the Congress provided five billions for the installation of safety aids, would that in any way guarantee my safety as an air passenger?

Mr. STEFAN. Money will not save your life in the air. Appropriations cannot do that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly it will not. I would rather have the loyal and dedicated service of the air-transport personnel than all the safety devices you can conceive of. You can fill the country full of safety devices but unless you have a loyal staff on those planes, when a man, woman, or child takes a plane he places his life in jeopardy. I fly all over this country. I could be a great supporter for air-safety aids, but we need something besides air-safety aids. You cannot buy safety with money alone, you have got to have something else.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to restore the budget estimate. They had \$19,622,000 of which they spent only \$10,000,000. I repeat, they have \$9,050,000 on hand. That plus \$17,638,000 in this bill will give them a total of \$26,688,000.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

If the pending bill in any measure reflects the general thinking of the Congress then the mandate given it at the polls last November to reduce Government costs is being outrageously ignored. I say this with all deference to my colleagues, but the matter is so serious that it merits the use of strong words.

The report shows a saving of roundly \$163,000,000 for the Departments of

State, Justice, and Commerce and the Judiciary over the budget estimate for 1948 of roundly \$699,000,000, but an increase of roundly \$27,000,000 over the 1947 appropriation, so that instead of reducing the cost of these four departments, the bill would increase it.

I think a better picture can be had of what is taking place in the way of expenditures for the operation of these departments by comparing them with those of prewar years. For the period 1936-39, according to the Statistical Abstract, the total cost for operating the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments averaged about \$80,000,000 annually. The pending bill calls for an expenditure of roundly \$519,000,000 for those three departments for the year 1948, or approximately 6½ times more than the average for the prewar years mentioned.

The appropriation provided in the bill for the State Department deserves special comment. Judging from the mess this Department has helped to make of our international affairs the whole business ought to be liquidated and reconstituted by substituting quality for quantity. Yet this bill appropriates approximately \$38,000,000 more for the Department of State than it was given for the present fiscal year and about 11 times more than it received on an average annually from 1936 to 1939.

The Congress is pursuing an impossible policy—attempts to reduce operating costs while retaining the governmental functions that came into being during the war and several years prior thereto, if it is not actually adding to those functions. No profounder fallacy could be imagined. Costs can be reduced only by eliminating functions. Common sense tells us this.

I am sure the voters in casting their ballots last November intended that Congress should drastically reduce the burdensome overhead of the Government, regardless of what might be required to accomplish this. My position is such that I cannot consistently vote for this measure.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, no one is more interested in safety in air navigation than I. In opposing this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York it is because with the \$17,000,000 appropriated to them in this bill and the \$9,000,000 unexpended balance they have, making a total of \$26,000,000, it makes me believe that perhaps we have appropriated even too much money. I make that statement because in the course of its investigation of safety in air navigation my committee put out an interim report from which

the gentleman from New York has quoted, and then we proceeded on for a number of weeks more and are still continuing our investigation of air-navigation lanes. It is quite apparent that we may have spoken a little too soon. The enthusiasm of the moment, not realizing that war had produced these wonderful new gadgets for providing safety, has resulted in our overlooking a few things.

The CAA has been working for 15 years on what is known as an instrument-landing system. Until the radar business was developed by the Army that was the best system that had been devised; however, it has many faults, it has many difficulties, and I doubt that most of them can be overcome.

The ILS system has been installed quite extensively by the CAA in the United States. I have a report in my file which indicates that out of the 19 systems that were installed, I believe up to March, only a very few of them operated satisfactorily. Subsequently there have been an additional number installed, I think about 42 or some such figure. As I see it, that is enough of those systems in the United States for the time being at least, even though they work perfectly.

We need the ILS, the GCA, or any sort of system like those at only a relatively few airports in the United States and those few are the ones that have the heaviest traffic density. It would appear, though, that the CAA has taken our committee recommendation quite literally and intends to install this very expensive equipment at every commercial airport in the United States, which is utterly ridiculous; it is absurd. These equipments are to enable landing of aircraft in congested airports and not in the cow pasture airports of the United States.

The same thing can be said for the so-called high intensity approach light system. That also is needed in only a few important airports of the United States, such as Chicago, New York, Washington, Dallas, Tex., San Francisco, Los Angeles, and perhaps three, four, or five more places in the United States, and it is only needed in those particular airports because of the importance of getting the aircraft down and into the principal terminal airports on time and safely. Where the traffic density is light those items of equipment are not seriously needed.

Mr. Chairman, it is about time that the committee take a look to see what the CAA is proposing to do here. I am surprised to find a budget presented in this great amount of money. I had not conceived in helping to write the recommendations made by our committee that they were going to spread this equipment into every airport used commercially in the United States. I trust that before we go to increasing the present proposals we may be permitted to take a look at how far this equipment is supposed to be spread over the United States. My committee will be very glad to do that.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I concur in what the gentleman has said. Is it not true that

these different types of approach systems are still in the experimental stage?

Mr. HINSHAW. Indeed they are, and certain of them have proven to be quite good and others not so good.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true also that there is quite a difference of opinion among the advocates of the different types of landing approaches as to which might accomplish the greatest objective toward safety?

Mr. HINSHAW. That is very true. The Army and Navy both are greatly in favor of the GCA system and they have supplied free 20 of these pieces of equipment to the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Of course, the CAA has to modify them and install them. But let us take a look at this situation and see how it is going to work before we spread it out all over the country.

I must therefore oppose this amendment and I oppose it with the idea that the amount might be even a little bit less and we would still be in good shape.

So far as the installation of the high-frequency omnidirectional range system is concerned we do need that system over the heavily traveled routes, as for instance, from Chicago to New York and New York to Washington. But for the moment it is not so important that we spread it all over the whole United States. We must consider one question here, gentlemen, which my committee is trying very hard to resolve and find the answer to, and that is this, that with the ILS system, with the Army directional range system, very high frequency radio equipment, the private flier, the itinerant flier, can get no benefit from it at all, because he cannot load his airplane down with the weight of the equipment that is required for this system. We must find a proper piece of equipment for our airway system that will provide proper air navigational aid not only to the commercial air lines, but to the private-flier, the itinerant flier, the nonscheduled air lines, and the Army and Navy fliers, both in the bomber classification and in the fighter types, and when we find that system which will suit all of those types of aircraft—and I think we will have it in very short order now, perhaps a matter of only a few months, why then we will really have something that will be of benefit to the United States in both peace and war. But, to go ahead with this present program the way it is proposed now I think is wrong. I am in favor of giving them money enough to equip the essential airports of the United States. I think they have already done it, and as far as the rest of them are concerned, I think we might as well wait and take a look to see how the present equipment will operate and whether it will be of real benefit. Therefore I take the position with the majority of the committee on this item. In looking over the balance of the bill, I agree with them on the other items in the bill and believe that the committee position should be sustained. I differ with them only in the matter of control-tower operation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, some time ago this Congress, under the Reorganization Act, took steps to work economy in government. I am in absolute harmony with that program. I doubt if I have failed to support the committee in its effort at economy at any time since we went into session. It is my intention to continue to support the committee, but I am vitally interested in an airport in my district. We have several, but there is one very large one in my home town of Dunkirk, N. Y.; it is, in fact, one of the finest airports in this country. It is built on a plot of 500 acres of ground, where there are no obstructions and it is in close proximity to the city. It is on the main air route from the east; that is, from New England west through to Chicago. There is an area along the Great Lakes where there are all kinds of hazardous weather conditions. The hazards there are very great. A plane in distress, we will say, in Buffalo, going west, or one in distress at Erie or Cleveland, traveling east, has only this airport at Dunkirk, N. Y., where it has an opportunity to land. We had a communication and weather station service there. It has been taken away from that airport. It is working great injury. I understand that, whether these amendments increasing the amounts are adopted or not, the Bureau has ample money to take care of such situations as we have in the city of Dunkirk.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I know the great concern that the gentleman from New York has in the airport at Dunkirk, and I am in sympathy with him because he has talked to me on numerous occasions about that, and he has talked to the Department. I want to call attention, however, to the fact, that the CAA has \$71,000,000 this year for salaries and operating expenses in which this is included. They had only \$55,000,000 last year. We are allowing them \$71,000,000. It is an administrative problem over which we have no control. While I deeply sympathize with the gentleman from New York, that problem has to be solved between him and the people downtown.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the chairman for those remarks. I realize fully that that is the situation. I do not know whether or not the question of politics enters into the matter of removing these services, but I know that whenever you call that bureau or any other bureau about some service of which you are about to be deprived or have been deprived their invariable answer is, "Well, the fault is with Congress in not providing sufficient money." There is sufficient money here, and the reason I am taking the floor today is that I hold in my hand a protest on the part of every prominent businessman and every organization protesting against the removal of this service. I just wanted to take the floor so the facts could be brought out here. I still propose to go down the line of economy with the committee. I happen to be on a committee which is trying to raise the revenue to

run this Government and pay on our debt, so I am going along the lines of economy; but these people have the money, as the chairman has said, if they wish to administer it in the interest of the public at these airports.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 35, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Technical development: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relative to such developmental work and service testing as tends to the creation of improved air-navigation facilities, including landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances, personnel, and operation methods, and personal services in the District of Columbia; acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle and operation and maintenance of five aircraft; \$2,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 47, line 17, strike out "one" and insert "two"; and in line 18, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$3,500,000."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I propose would increase the amount allowed by the majority of the committee to the Civil Aeronautics Authority for technical development from \$2,000,000 to \$3,500,000, as requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Of all the fields in which to practice false economy, it is my considered opinion that aviation is the most dangerous; and of all the areas in aviation in which men should be free to seek improvement, technical development is the most important. Of course I realize that on this amendment just as on the last amendment for establishment of air-navigation facilities we will not find any more than one or two friends on the other side of the aisle.

The majority members of this committee have hit at the very heart of aviation progress in their cut of \$1,500,000 from the funds of the CAA's Technical Development Service. This would be a wilfully blind and unthinking cut at any time. But at this time when we are emerging from a war, in which tremendous vistas of technical advancement have been unfolded which can be developed and adapted for civilian aviation use; and when the passenger mileage of United States scheduled air lines has reached the astounding figure of 7,000,000,000 miles, making it imperative that the highest standards of safety be maintained, a cut of 43 percent in a total budget request of a comparatively small \$3,500,000 borders closely on the irresponsible.

Gentlemen, we have always been niggardly with the CAA in funds for technical development. This is different from invention and research. In technical development, we take a known and existing invention, or plan, or method, and bring it to the point where it is applicable to daily aviation needs.

This is not in the field of pure research. It is the direct and practical answer to an existing need.

Here is a good example: Airplanes in flight are continually running into birds while in flight. Deaths have resulted when these collisions incapacitated pilots. A better windshield was needed, and a better one was developed—not invented—by the CAA. Today, your friends and relatives who travel by air are protected from this hazard.

There are dozens of other examples, such as instrument landing aids, better lights for night flying, gas tanks that will not burst and flame in the event of a crash, simple gadgets to warn the pilot when his plane is about to stall, fireproof brake fluid, and all the many and mysterious aids that come from the radio field.

Another is the constant study of fire discovery and prevention in the nacelle of the engines which power the aircraft both large and small. Such developments already have reduced the danger of fire but much more work is under way and must be completed.

Today we have the whole field of radar opened up for exploitation. Promising as radar was during the war, it will be of no value for many years in civilian flying without the development which every new electronics device requires. The cut which the committee has imposed on this service will eliminate all radar developmental programs and work on radio and fog-dispersing systems. These would make possible contact flight landing conditions in bad weather and reduce one of the greatest hazards to safe flying.

The cut also proposes to eliminate a complete program of better flying charts for the private flier which will advance the day when private flying will produce an industry of economic importance to this Nation. Better charts would increase personal flying, and better charts can be developed if funds are allowed for the purpose.

Radar charts for air navigation sound like a more distant objective. But it is exactly this kind of advance planning through which aviation gets its fastest growth. It is too new a field to accept what is available today and not seize every possible chance for improvement.

The CAA asked for only \$3,500,000 for its total developmental program.

If we want to stop where we are in this matter of safety on the airways, we can ignore this kind of developmental work. If we want to go on with our announced program of safer airway aids, we must not starve that unit of our Government charged with this fundamentally important project.

I urge the Members on the majority side of the aisle to consider adoption of my proposed amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this is just another example of how an effort is being made to restore every penny of the budget estimates in this bill.

What is the story about this item of technical development in the CAA? You should know. This committee has not been deaf to the pleas of people to have technical development of aviation. Of course, we know that private industry

does a great deal of that research too, much more will have to be done. But listen to what we have done about it. For technical development this year the CAA has \$925,000, and we gave them \$2,000,000 for the next fiscal year—more than double.

I hope that is of enough importance to indicate to you what this effort is, to increase these budget estimates.

I sincerely ask that you vote down this amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to increase this appropriation by \$1,500,000. After reading the hearings and after recalling the testimony that was presented before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the past 3 months, I seriously thought of introducing an amendment to further reduce the \$2,000,000 item. Neither \$2,000,000 nor \$3,500,000 is any more than a drop in the bucket compared to what we will have to spend for development of aircraft and aircraft engines in the United States in the next few years if we are going to keep pace with the rest of the world. However, I do not think the Civil Aeronautics Administration is the proper agency to carry on that technical development and research work. I would like to see this taken completely out of the CAA and turned over to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, an agency created by the Congress for that purpose.

Reference has been made to the fact that units of the aviation industry are carrying on research work. Many of them are, but indirectly the funds which they spend for research must also come from the Treasury of the United States, for the reason that the industry has not the money needed to carry on all necessary research.

I think one of the most difficult problems this Congress will deal with in the Eightieth Congress is the determination of just how we are going to finance technical research and development. The aviation industry in this country today, two short years after the end of the war, has dropped down and down and down to almost nothing. There are only about 2 of the 12 major units in the aviation industry that are today operating in the black. I understand a resolution has been offered in the other body to study this whole question of providing adequate funds for these research projects within the industry, and through the Army and the Navy. So I do not think this \$1,500,000 is going to be any contribution toward a solution. I think the more we have these agencies dabbling into it, spending a million here and a million there, the less real progress we will make. So I hope until the whole program can be considered intelligently, with due consideration to the importance of the aviation industry to national defense, we will not go on increasing these appropriations that will not do the job that must be done.

I agreed with the Committee on the amendment previously rejected, but before yielding the floor I just want to make this one remark: I hope the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. JONES], for whom I have a high regard, will, when he reads his remarks in the RECORD this evening, strike out that part that seemed to me impugned the motives of all of those who supported the amendment to restore the control-tower item. I do not think I have to say to the House that I, for one, was not influenced by the fact that there was a control tower or is a control tower within my congressional district. I voted for that item because I felt one of the most dangerous things we could do would be to break any link of the airport control-tower system that has been built up over the years. Saving lives and protecting property was my only interest.

I hope the gentleman made those remarks in the heat of debate, and in the cool of this evening that he will strike them from the RECORD.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 19, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: For carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946 (except section 5 (a)), \$32,500,000, to be available until June 30, 1953, of which \$29,000,000 shall be for projects in the States in accordance with sections 5 (b) and 6 of said act, and \$1,662,500 shall be for projects in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in accordance with section 5 (c): *Provided*, That not to exceed \$1,837,500 of the said \$32,500,000 shall be available as one fund for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; the purchase of 15 and hire of passenger motor vehicles; of which \$1,837,500 not to exceed \$176,000 may be transferred to the "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration," to provide for necessary administrative expenses, including the maintenance and operation of aircraft, and \$26,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "Printing and binding, Department of Commerce": *Provided further*, That the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1947 is hereby merged with this appropriation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY:

On page 48, line 8, strike out "\$32,500,000" and insert "\$65,000,000."

Line 9, strike out "\$29,000,000" and insert "\$58,000,000."

Line 11, strike out "\$1,662,500" and insert "\$3,325,000."

Line 13, strike out "\$1,836,500" and insert "\$3,675,000."

Line 14, strike out "\$32,500,000" and insert "\$65,000,000."

Line 17, strike out "fifteen" and insert "thirty."

Line 18, strike out "\$1,837,500" and insert "\$3,675,000."

Line 18, strike out "\$176,000" and insert "\$352,000."

Line 22, strike out "\$26,000" and insert "\$52,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment concerns the item for the Federal-aid airport program which was discussed here yesterday and the day before. It is the amendment which concerns all those States and cities which I enumerated on the floor of the House and which you will find in the RECORD of last Tuesday. I do not have the page number immediately in front of me but it is somewhere in the vicinity of page 5195 or 5196.

Mr. Chairman, this Federal-aid airport program is not one under which the Federal Government expends on these airport projects the entire amount of money required to construct them. I believe the average contribution by the Federal Government is approximately 50 percent. At the present time, as shown on page 885 of the hearings before the Appropriations Committee on the Commerce Department appropriation, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has received project requests from sponsors or proposed sponsors of airport projects totaling in excess of \$585,000,000, of which approximately \$235,000,000 would represent the Federal share.

The Department states that if they receive the amount they originally requested, \$65,000,000, which was cut exactly 50 percent by the majority members of this committee, they can perform many very critical, badly needed jobs of airport improvement and airport development.

They state that the \$65,000,000 which they request would be split generally as follows, as shown on page 886 of the hearings:

Forty-three million five hundred thousand dollars would be funds for State allocation in accordance with the regular area-population formula as prescribed in the act;

Three million five hundred thousand dollars would be for work in the territories of which only \$175,000 is an administrative fund;

Fourteen million five hundred thousand dollars would be a discretionary fund which we have programed along with the regular State appropriation; and

Three million five hundred thousand dollars is for engineering, administration, and supervision of the program.

I take it for granted that every Member of the House is familiar with the Federal-aid airport program, and familiar with the fact that it applies to all these cities which I enumerated on the day before yesterday. I am quite sure that the gentlemen on the majority side of the aisle are not going to fail to respond to a single vote on this amendment as they did on my previous two amendments, which were so vitally necessary for the safety and development of the aviation industry in this country.

This item for our airport program, incidentally, is one that is vitally necessary in connection with our plan of national defense. If you flew over England during the war and saw how there was just one airfield after another, and how necessary their airfields were in the de-

fense of their realm, you cannot but vote for the inclusion of the additional \$32,500,000 in this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would also restore the budget estimate for the Federal-aid airport program. Let us review the matter of airports. I endeavored to explain that the other day in my general statement but I will repeat it briefly at this time.

We have now 4,728 airports in all classes; that is classes 1, 2, 3, 4, and larger. You might be interested to know that we have 2,703 class 1 airports, 777 class 2 airports, 490 class 3 airports, and we have in the larger classes of airports, class 4 and above, 758, which makes a total of 2,728 airports.

As explained by previous speakers, our airport program is a goal of 6,300 approximately in a 7-year period. In the 3-year period we planned to include 4,400 airports. Of the larger airports we are getting many back from the Army and Navy. The Army and Navy have turned over to us about 400 of these larger airports which were built for war purposes and they are not included in this total of 4,728. They told us in our committee that the Army and Navy have 1,200 more of these gigantic airports to turn over as surplus, which will be available to the cities, the communities, and the States.

When we started the Federal-State aid airport program we figured we were going to spend about \$500,000,000 over a period of 7 years to build new airports and help communities to construct them, matching the funds similar to the way we match funds for Federal aid to highways. So the CAA set up a plan. We implemented the authorization last year with \$45,000,000 for the purpose of improving and constructing smaller airports. The President froze \$41,000,000 of that amount, and the CAA has a discretionary fund of around \$4,000,000 which they are using at this time. So the 1947 money is in the hands of the CAA for the small airports, but not one penny of it has been expended as yet; not one cent of it. They will begin spending it for the smaller airports soon, this \$41,000,000 that has been frozen by the President. They are asking for \$65,000,000 for the 1948 program which they originally intended for the class 4, or larger airports.

The committee reviewed the entire condition of this airport program, and we find CAA will have \$73,500,000 on hand. We sent aviation experts into the CAA, pilots, technical experts, and budgetary officers who know something about budgets, who know something about airports, and who know something about the State situations, because they have learned that many of the communities cannot match these funds. So, we figured this program should be reviewed.

I am asked by my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], to read you a paragraph of the hearings. Mr. Wright, the Administrator, in answer to a question about the

\$41,000,000 that has been frozen by the President, said:

Yes, sir. In making this 1948 request which is before you now, the same sort of question was asked of us and it was agreed that for the fiscal year 1948, we could limit our expenditures out of the Treasury to \$50,000,000 which would be involved in both the residue of the 1947 appropriation and the \$65,000,000 appropriation for which we are asking for 1948.

I ask that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I see there are about six or seven people who wish to speak. I just wonder how much time that would give us.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAVENS. If this motion prevails, would that prevent any debate on any other amendment that might be offered to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. To this paragraph. The debate has to come within the 25 minutes.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the Committee for the purpose of pleading with 't to redeem the good faith of the United States in connection with which in excess of 300 municipalities in the United States have relied. This Government enacted only a short time ago authorized an airport program. I do not believe it is the intention of this Congress to go back on an implied contract with those municipalities made so recently for airport construction, under which municipalities of this country have provided themselves with funds in order to participate. There are in excess of 300 municipalities in this country that have already in reliance upon this program, either by taxation or by the floating and sale of bonds, raised money with which to match every single solitary cent the Congress promised them less than 2 years ago.

I speak of the case of my own city because I am more familiar with it than with any other. As recently as last October the city of Fort Smith in reliance on this plan called an election, and issued, and sold bonds to the tune of \$750,000. We have that money lying idle in the bank there today, unable to use it because this program is being crippled by this proposed slice in this appropriation.

The 300 or more cities I have referred to are planning class 4 or larger airports.

There are hundreds of others to which the \$41,000,000 that has been carried over has already been allocated. All I am pleading for is the restoration of this appropriation to the amount promised, so that the construction of class 4 and larger airports under the program of the CAA can get under way, and so the United States Government will redeem its promise and show its good faith to the municipalities who have raised funds, and who are ready to proceed with this program as soon as the Government provides its share of the funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to rise again, but as these reductions have been pretty generally on party lines, I wish to read a telegram I have here from a very distinguished Marylander who is now mayor of Baltimore, a Republican, who did not seek reelection. The telegram is as follows:

Baltimore has already completed master plan, acquired 25,000 acres of land, begun grading, draining and compacting operation for runways, taxi strips, and apron for great commercial airport on Friendship Church site. City has spent nearly \$1,750,000 and has contracted to spend before end of year more than two million additional. Under CAA approved formula for Federal participation in project included in Federal airways program Friendship Church project, which has been recommended, rates upward to \$2,000,000 in Federal funds this year. We believe progress made on this important project places it in different category from those in planning state where construction work not actually under way. Urge united effort Maryland delegation to restore cut in amount recommended for Friendship Church airport by CAA and President plus additional sum more nearly to comply with CAA formula. Your cooperation urgently solicited.

It is signed by Theodore R. McKeldin, mayor of Baltimore.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there is one aspect of this issue now before us that I do not think we have considered sufficiently, and that is, in encouraging and getting the various municipalities to embark upon a good airfield-expansion program. Several years ago the Congress undertook a difficult job because naturally there is a certain amount of lethargy on the part of various municipalities to get going on this very important program. But they did get going. They did make their plans based upon the representations of the Congress. Now the Congress cannot break faith with those municipalities.

Like many other cities, my city of Milwaukee did make those plans. I wish to read a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Milwaukee County. It is as follows:

Whereas there is presently pending in the Congress of the United States Senate Document No. 14, making appropriations for airport-construction aid for various airports throughout the United States which bill includes a sum of \$650,000 to be appropriated for the improvement of General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee County's airport; and

Whereas Milwaukee County is presently spending millions of dollars for the enlargement and improvement of this particular air-

port and has secured approval of many additional schedules by transcontinental lines: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors in regular meeting assembled this 22d day of April 1947. That said board requests the earnest support of the above-mentioned congressional bill by Representatives of the Fourth and Fifth Districts of Wisconsin, and by the United States Senators of Wisconsin; and be it

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to United States Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, and Congress Representatives CHARLES J. KERSTEN and JOHN C. BROPHY.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has stated a situation which exists throughout the United States. I hope the committee will take heed.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, it is rather difficult to explain this situation in 2½ minutes. I wish there were time to show how the gentlemen of the committee who reported this are wholly in error in their position.

In the first place, the 1947 fiscal year appropriation of \$45,000,000 has already been allotted up to the amount of approximately \$35,000,000 for class 1, 2, and 3 airports. The act which I helped to report out of our committee and which was passed by the Congress provided an allocation of the appropriation to each of the States. The amount allocated to one State cannot be used by any other State. If there are unexpended funds remaining in any appropriation or allocation, they must remain for that State.

Let me show you how that operates. In the 1947 appropriation for present fiscal year for classes 1, 2, and 3 airports, approximately \$3,000,000 is left of the \$41,000,000 yet to be allocated for additional projects. Only that \$3,000,000 can be used for the development of class 4 and larger airports for future allocation. The gentlemen, however, would indicate to you that all of that \$41,000,000 is unexpended and can be used for the 1948 program in the development of class 4 and larger airports. I say under the law, it cannot now be so used. It is important that this amount be restored.

In section 9 of the Airport Act, subsection (d), it is provided that all projects shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, and that approval shall be given only if at the time of approval funds are available for payment of the United States share of the allowable project cost.

In other words, until the appropriation is actually made, no negotiations or contracts for the development of projects in municipalities can proceed. Certainly you cannot use \$73,000,000 withdrawal of funds from the Treasury in 1948. Certainly they are right when they say only about \$50,000,000 would be actually spent and withdrawn from the Treasury. But the fact remains, if the appropriation is not made the program, under

the law, cannot proceed. What we are doing here is to say to the municipalities throughout the country, "You cannot proceed in carrying out the development program authorized in the act of 1946."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has expired.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, my city of St. Louis had much the same attitude. We have a Republican mayor, similar to that which Baltimore enjoyed. The mayor and I are good friends personally and politically, but I have a dutiful course to follow in the necessary economy program. I have a wire here which I would like to read:

ST. LOUIS, MO., May 7, 1947.

Hon. WALTER C. PLOESER,
House Office Building:

St. Louis vigorously opposes action of House Appropriations Committee in reducing CAA grants to cities for airport development. Loss of almost \$1,000,000 to St. Louis thereby constitutes serious blow to our aviation program. Also protest action by same committee in eliminating all funds for CAA operation of airport-traffic control towers. CAA is logical agency to operate towers, as they must be integrated with each other over the Nation for satisfactory and effective service. Operation of such facilities by municipalities would be a step backward and a detriment to aviation progress and safety.

ALOYS P. KAUFMAN,
Mayor, City of St. Louis.

But let me read to you the response to that wire:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 9, 1947.

Mayor A. P. KAUFMAN,
St. Louis, Mo.:

Reduction of Federal expenditures is not only desirable but imperative. Solvency of the Nation must be regained. The idea "cut everybody but me" will not work. The St. Louis Airport has done well. It is my duty to support reductions and the duty of everyone to support public frugality.

WALTER C. PLOESER,
Member of Congress.

I think if a Representative from St. Louis, Mo., can take that attitude, then everybody else in this Congress can go along with the absolute need of reducing expenditures where they can properly be reduced—and this is the place. As a matter of fact, there will be \$73,500,000 in the appropriation included with this bill for the fiscal year 1948. There is an agreement not to expend more than \$50,000,000. So, regardless of the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas, there would be no more than \$50,000,000 spent in the coming fiscal year. According to my way of looking at this, had I had the authority to state this appropriation, it would have been \$23,500,000 less. I do not state that to criticize the committee, but I think they might have held that money in the Treasury. I do not believe in even letting the money be over there for a bureaucrat to flirt with. If you are going to criticize this committee, then criticize your President, who froze \$41,000,000 of these funds last year and prevented their expenditure during 1947.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. No. I have only 2½ minutes.

I supported the amendment to restore the \$4,000,000 on the airport control, with the statement that I hoped provision would be made by law that it becomes a reimbursable program in the following fiscal year. I think it is time for us to recognize that even subsequent to the date of many of these airport plans, the American public called for drastic reduction in Federal expenditures. I for one believe that every municipality should stand its share alike.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to get some information from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], with particular reference to an airport project in my own district, at Davenport, Iowa. It is listed in Senate Document 14, which is a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, giving the request of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for these projects. It is listed as a new project to be built in the Davenport-Moline area, on which the sponsor is to put up \$1,020,000 and the Federal Government \$1,000,000. I notice in a release by the Department of Commerce, dated May 7, a complete analysis of this appropriation bill. In attachment B thereto is listed for this project in Davenport a reduction of \$580,000 in the Federal share of that particular project.

I wanted to ask at this point whether that indicated reduction means they are going to start this airport and delay its completion or whether they are going to build less than a class 4 airport. What effect will this proposed reduction in appropriation have on the plan as announced in this Senate Document 14? What will be the effect of the reduction of this appropriation from \$65,000,000 to \$32,500,000 on any new airport development such as that?

Mr. STEFAN. The CAA will have over \$72,000,000 to expend on both classes of airports. It is up to the States and municipalities which have been allocated a certain amount as far as the 1947 allocation is concerned. They will not lose any of that. What proportion of the \$32,500,000 they will get is a matter, of course, of administration. They will not, however, be able to spend anywhere near that amount this year. So the net result will be that such an airport will not lose anything at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Then the cut made by the Committee on Appropriations does not indicate an abandonment of a new airport project such as the one at Davenport, Iowa?

Mr. STEFAN. No. As a matter of fact, the entire program will ultimately be reviewed.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. It does not indicate an indefinite delay?

Mr. STEFAN. No. The entire program will have to be reviewed for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, according to the evidence taken before the committee, the CAA will not spend, during the next year, more than \$50,000,000. They have \$41,000,000 already frozen by the President and are given \$32,500,000 more here or a total of more than they propose to spend; therefore, it seems likely that this amendment will be defeated. Due to the imposed limitation of debate, however, and the fact that I probably will not have an opportunity to explain later an amendment I expect to offer, I rise at this time to call attention to it. My amendment is designed to put a limitation on the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics so that he cannot arbitrarily name certain airports for construction. This should appeal to all those Members who are affected by the list of airports which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has given us. As many of you who have called the Administrator know, he has said: "We are going to build such-and-such airports and we are going to eliminate such-and-such."

The reasons for his action are not for discussion here, but my amendment will provide that the appropriation made does not grant to the Administrator authority to undertake during the fiscal year any specific projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports unless express approval of Congress is hereafter granted. Under existing law, the Federal Airport Act of May 13, 1946, unless we put this provision in this appropriation bill he will have just that leeway. I read from the law as follows:

In granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated to pay the United States share of allowable project costs during the next fiscal year, the Administrator may consider such appropriation as granting the authority requested—

Namely, to construct certain specific airports—

Unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress by law.

The purpose of the amendment which will be offered in the event of the defeat of this amendment will be to manifest a contrary intent, and to say to the Administrator that he cannot construct any airports which he may arbitrarily select in the class 4 and larger group, unless approval of Congress is hereafter obtained.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will not adopt this amendment. There has been no airport construction this year. Thirty-two and a half million dollars added to the \$44,500,000, which is going to be left from the current year's appropriation, would make \$77,000,000 available. Why that is not enough to start an airport program, I cannot understand. I believe it is far more than can be intelligently expended.

This House voted an intention to cut \$6,000,000,000 from the total appropriations. I hope that as they approach this item the Members will realize that they

are not going to get anywhere by adding \$32,500,000 to this appropriation. I hope, therefore, that the amendment will be rejected, and that we can go ahead along toward saving money in this situation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CURTIS). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HORAN).

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the record is extremely clear on this matter and I shall take time enough to review what has happened. A year ago last Tuesday we passed the Federal Airways Act and this Congress in order to place that in operation appropriated \$45,000,000 before we went home. Shortly after we left for home the President froze all but \$4,000,000 of that money. Mr. Wright in appearing before our committee had this to say:

The President desired as few disbursements from the Treasury as possible, particularly on public works items, for this year.

That is the year which we will complete on June 30. We have been assured that this money will be available on the first of July for disbursement.

We come now to the fiscal year 1948, still working under the act passed by this Congress which expends a half-billion dollars for airport construction over a 7-year period. Our subcommittee has agreed to this program.

What did the CAA do this year? They do not know exactly what they are doing either, because their first figure was a little in excess of \$104,000,000 for the fiscal year 1948. That is what they went to the Department with. The Department did not know what they ought to spend or how and they cut it down to \$85,000,000. Then they went to the Bureau of the Budget which cut it down another \$20,000,000 to \$65,000,000. That is the item that appeared in the committee print before this subcommittee.

The CAA has already agreed that it will not withdraw more than \$50,000,000 from the Federal Treasury for the construction of airports in the fiscal year 1948. Note that particularly. That is the agreement that is in the hearings not once but in two or three places. Against that commitment on the part of the executive department your subcommittee added to the \$41,000,000 that will be available on July 1 the sum of \$32,500,000. Perhaps we were wrong in the light of the commitments of CAA and the President, perhaps we were derelict in appropriating \$23,500,000 additional, but in no event can I see any rhyme or reason to the amendment now before the committee.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. With respect to the \$41,000,000 that the gentleman refers to as remaining available for airports, is it not true that upwards of \$35,000,000 of that money has already been allocated to class 1, 2, and 3 airports, leaving only about \$5,000,000 of that fund which could be allocated to class 4 and above airports?

Mr. HORAN. Of course, in the light of the CAA already having agreed to not withdraw more than \$50,000,000 from the Federal Treasury for 1948, I do not see any wisdom in allocation other than to stir up individuals to appeal to the Congress.

Mr. CRAVENS. But that allocation has been made to class 1, 2, and 3 airports.

Mr. HORAN. Allocations mean nothing if there is an agreement that restricts the amount of expenditure.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point or order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROONEY).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 44, noes 79.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. STEFAN and Mr. ROONEY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 46, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I understand has the support of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 49, line 2, after "appropriation", insert the following: "Provided further, That the appropriation made herein does not grant the authority to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to undertake during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, any specific projects for the development of class 4 and larger airports, unless express approval of Congress is hereafter granted."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it strikes me that this is a limitation upon the appropriation, which is in order. The law as it is today provides that the making of an appropriation shall be an approval of certain specific projects, unless a contrary intent of Congress is manifested. The purpose of this amendment is to manifest the contrary intent of Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, under the Federal Airport Act passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress and approved on May 13, 1946, the authority under which this appropriation is being considered today, it is specifically provided in section 5 (d) for the annual appropriation of projects in the States.

In section 6 it is specifically provided how the fund shall be apportioned to the

various States and it is also provided how the Administrator shall proceed in making an annual report to the Congress 60 days prior to the fiscal year under which the appropriation would be made for class 4 and larger airports.

In section 9 (d) it is provided how the approval of these airport projects may be made.

I should like to read wherein that authorization provides: "that all such projects"—meaning class 4 and larger airports—"shall be subject to the approval of the Administrator, which approval shall be given only if at the time of the approval funds are available for payment of the United States share of the allowable cost and only if he is satisfied that the project will contribute to the accomplishment of the purposes of the act," and so forth.

Under the authorization of this act the Administrator is given certain authority, and if I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman it will change the specific authorization as provided in those sections just referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the basis of the point of order made by the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. HARRIS. It is legislation on an appropriation bill. It changes the authorization of the Airport Act of May 13, 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has failed to read section 8 of the act which provides for the filing with the Congress 2 months in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year of the list of projects. Then, in the last sentence thereof, it says:

In granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated to pay the United States' share of allowable project cost during the next fiscal year, the Administrator may consider such appropriation as granting the authority requested by law unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress by law.

This is the only time that the Congress can manifest its intent, and if it passes this appropriation bill simply appropriating the money and does not manifest the intent that is there stated, then they have approved of the action of the Administrator.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from South Dakota rise?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To make a brief observation, if the Chairman will indulge me.

Mr. Chairman, I have briefly examined the text of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KEATING). While the language submitted is not in the form of the customary limitation on funds, it occurs to me that it is the equivalent of saying that no part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the construction of class 4 airports. If it were stated in that way it would clearly be a limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair is of the opinion that this is not merely a limitation but that it is

legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 49, line 2, after the word "appropriation", insert the following: "Provided further, That no part of the appropriation made herein shall be used for the development of class 4 and larger airports unless approval of Congress is hereafter granted."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment as being legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PRIEST. Just very briefly. It seems to me that the argument with reference to the other point of order would apply here. The Administrator, on February 19, 1947, has complied with the requirement of law and has made the required report to Congress.

In reading section 8 of the act, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING], in commenting on the point of order made against the other amendment, it seems to me did not properly interpret the last part of section 8 of the act, and that the amendment actually would change the law by action on an appropriation bill, when the act specifically says:

In granting any funds that thereafter may be appropriated to pay the United States' share of allowable project costs during the next fiscal year, the Administrator may consider such appropriation as granting the authority requested, unless a contrary intent shall have been manifested by the Congress by a law or by concurrent resolution.

This, it would seem to me, would be by amendment to an appropriation bill rather than by a law or by a concurrent resolution, and it would appear that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, as indicated by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], this is clearly simply a limitation upon the amount of an appropriation, and it seems to me to be clearly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is a limitation, and the point of order is overruled.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 37, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAVENS: On page 48, line 8, strike out "\$32,500,000" and insert "\$57,500,000."

In line 9, page 48, strike out "\$29,000,000" and insert "\$54,000,000."

In line 14, page 48, strike out "\$32,500,000" and insert "\$57,500,000."

Page 49, line 2, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "and said merged appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 shall not exceed an expenditure of \$40,000,000."

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAVENS. Is it correct that under the limitation of debate that was adopted not long ago this amendment is not debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly ask the members of the Committee to agree to this amendment. It substantially restores the funds recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Authority for carrying out the airport program which this Congress approved during the last session. The CAA has made surveys of the needs of the various cities and municipalities throughout the country. These cities, municipalities, and States have taken effective action to meet their share of the obligation which is provided for under the airport bill. They have taken this action in good faith, feeling that the Congress would approve its share of the funds for carrying out the program that has been agreed upon. The program is needed. I think it is a modest one. These airports definitely are in the public interest. CAA has eliminated all that are not.

In my home city of Chattanooga plans have definitely been made based upon the improvement of the airport which the people of the city had a right to expect after the passage of the bill in the last Congress. The airport building has been enlarged and modernized. Unless this amendment is passed, the lengthening of the runways and other improvements which have been recommended by the CAA will have to be curtailed.

I do not think Congress will be acting in good faith to cut down this modest program after the last Congress approved it and after the cities and municipalities affected have made their plans to go along with it. I urgently ask that the members of the Committee sustain this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEFAUVER) there were—ayes 35, noes 81.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced a bill which would provide a permanent parity formula for agriculture. My Iowa colleagues in the House of Representatives, Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN, Hon. HENRY O. TALLE, Hon. JOHN W. GWYNNE, Hon. KARL M. LECOMPT, Hon. PAUL CUNNINGHAM, Hon. JAMES I. DOLLIVER, and Hon. BEN F. JENSEN, authorize me to announce that they join with me in sponsoring this bill.

Briefly, the bill provides for a 90-percent of parity loan on the seven basic farm crops—cotton, flaxseed, wheat, rye, corn, oats, and barley—as determined by the relative price levels of farm products as compared to goods which the farmer buys, using the July 1, 1925, to June 30, 1929, period as a basis of 100.

It provides for a 35-percent permanent reserve to protect our livestock industry against liquidation because of drought periods.

The bill provides for a flexible tariff at the parity level on all farm products. If and when the world price is equal to the domestic parity price level, the tariff would be at zero.

Under the provisions of the bill, exportable surpluses would be sold at world price levels, the differential between the parity price and world prices being assessed against the duties collected on imports of needed farm products.

Under the parity formula used, the bill would give the farmer approximately 7 percent above the price level established under the present formula.

The cost of surplus disposal would be automatically liquidated by the collection of import duties.

Most of the provisions of the bill are partially provided for under present legislation. The bill would correlate the various measures into a single program to provide permanent parity for agriculture.

With agriculture the governing factor in our economy in the approximate ratio of \$1 of gross farm income to \$7 of national income, passage of the bill would provide a permanent national income of approximately \$160,000,000,000 to \$175,000,000,000 as a foundation for permanent prosperity.

For a detailed analysis of a permanent farm program provided for in my bill, I refer you to the statement of Carl H. Wilson, economic analyst, Raw Materials National Council, Sioux City, Iowa, on page 2244, Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This bill, I hope, will focus the attention of all thinking people who are interested in the future of agriculture and a permanent program for agriculture. It may not be a perfect bill but I am sure it contains many suggestions which may ultimately be incorporated in a permanent farm bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Departmental salaries and expenses; For personal services and other necessary expenses of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at the seat of government, including the purchase of commercial and trade reports; temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public

Law 600), (not exceeding \$50,000); \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That expenses, except printing and binding, of field studies or surveys conducted by departmental personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the amount herein appropriated.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD:

Page 52, lines 10 and 11, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$5,015,000."

Line 12, after the word "surveys", insert a comma and the following: "including not to exceed \$15,000 for field studies and surveys in the Virgin Islands of the United States."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, down in the Virgin Islands, possessions of the United States, we have a problem which involves a great number of people wherein the United States Government, acting through the Congress, will either have to let those people somewhat support themselves or permit them to have funds from the Federal Treasury in the form of relief aid.

This amendment is offered to provide \$15,000 which can be used under the direction and supervision of the Department of Commerce for the establishment of some private industry operations there to be carried on by the people. It is possible—and I say this after having studied this question for a number of years and having made trips all through the islands on different occasions—for those down there to be largely self-sustaining.

We took away from them a great deal of their industry through putting into practice certain operations there under the Virgin Islands Company, a federally owned corporation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is that Virgin Islands Company about which the gentleman is talking the one Mr. Ickes set up to manufacture rum for the people of this country, a company in which everybody is a stockholder?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the company I am referring to.

What we need to do is to go down into the Virgin Islands and assist those people in getting back into business through their own efforts. The people in the islands can produce a great deal more of their food and make themselves less dependent upon foodstuffs imported from the United States; they can create a great deal of their own handwork in the way of small handcraft, in the way of needlework and in the way of the production of furniture from the woods that are available down in that section of the country. It is also entirely possible and practical for them to establish their own fishing industry and to turn out canned and smoked fish, disposing of it among themselves and among the Puerto Ricans who now import such a tremendous amount of their foodstuffs from northern areas such as Iceland and certain parts of Newfoundland where the fish are prepared.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. What is the gentleman's intention with regard to the expenditure of this \$15,000? For what purpose is it to be used?

Mr. CRAWFORD. This \$15,000 will be used through the Department of Commerce, looking to the establishment of further food industries and fish industries and other activities in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. ROONEY. What does the gentleman mean by that? Will that money be used for salary or salaries?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That money will be used by individuals who will go down there under the supervision of the Department of Commerce and set up this operation.

Mr. ROONEY. Does that include a certain gentleman?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know who this would include. I am not speaking for any particular individual. I am speaking on behalf of our putting into operation in the Virgin Islands individual efforts on the part of private individuals instead of having them fed out of the Federal Treasury. This would aim to make them self-supporting.

Mr. ROONEY. I appreciate the gentleman's great interest in the Virgin Islands, but I do not understand who is going to receive the \$15,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Neither do I; and I am not concerned about that, because I do not come here to lobby for any particular individual, and if the gentleman knew me well enough he would not mean to insinuate that I am interested in the individual who may draw the salary. I am interested in stopping the flood of Federal checks going down there, paid by the taxpayers and the bond buyers of the United States, and flowing to honest, decent people who can make a living for themselves if the Congress and the Government of the United States will let them do so.

Mr. FOULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FOULSON. Is it not true that the gentleman is chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Possessions and that he has studied this problem for a long time?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have been on the committee for about 13 years, and for 12 or 15 years prior to coming to Congress I spent considerable time on matters pertaining to the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may have three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I want the House and the gentleman to understand that, of course, I do not insinuate anything against him. I have the greatest respect

and admiration for the able gentleman. However, I was wondering with regard to this \$15,000 item why it is that the Department of Commerce cannot now use \$15,000 of the amount contained in this bill for that purpose from their appropriation for field offices?

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I do not know anybody on earth who would be better qualified to answer that question than the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, the Department can use it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This Department has full authority to proceed to use \$15,000 for that purpose, is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. I would say so and ask the gentleman from Nebraska whether or not that is correct?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If it is correct I would like to know why Mr. H. B. McCoy, Director, Office of Domestic Commerce, Department of Commerce, would send a letter up here to me indicating that he needed this money.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman from New York says that they can use this \$15,000 for that purpose, if I were the gentleman I would withdraw my amendment and ask the gentleman from New York to see that the Department does use it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But the gentleman from New York is not certain about his position at all.

Mr. TABER. I think, perhaps, for the information of the House, we should have before us the language of this paragraph. It says: "For personal services and other necessary expenses at the seat of government."

Therefore, it would not be an item that they could send down to the Virgin Islands. The following paragraph would be the one where they could do that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, if this amendment is adopted, then the paragraph to which the amendment applies would permit \$15,000 to be used for that purpose?

Mr. TABER. I am afraid that the language would be contradictory. I expect, if you want that kind of language, it should go in the next paragraph.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The language of my amendment specifically provides that \$15,000 should be used for studies and surveys in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. TABER. But the appropriating language is confined to the seat of government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, except as modified by my amendment.

Mr. TABER. No, because that is the only proviso, and the appropriating language is limited to the seat of government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. I have

great respect for the knowledge that the gentleman has regarding insular affairs. I believe he has visited every one of our insular possessions, not only part of them, but every portion of them.

However, this is an administrative matter and we believe that it should be so treated.

Also, in answer to the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and the answer of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I will say that he is absolutely correct. The amendment is in the wrong place. This money cannot be used for the purpose intended in this amendment. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not particularly interested in whether we adopt the Crawford amendment or write into the bill a proviso that a certain amount of money shall be set aside and made available for making the people of the Virgin Islands more self-supporting than they are at the present time. You will recall that some 16 or 18 years ago President Hoover visited the Virgin Islands and he was appalled at the poverty of the people, the unfortunates who live on the three islands, and termed the Virgin Islands the Nation's poorhouse.

Now \$15,000 may not seem very much, but a great deal could be done in the Virgin Islands with that amount of money toward making the people down there more self-sufficient. I have visited the Virgin Islands at least half a dozen times, and am confident that with some practical cooperation—and we have never given them any practical cooperation—we could save hundreds of thousands of dollars in money that we are now obliged to appropriate to keep things going down there.

I visited Haiti early in December for the first time since 1939 and was greatly impressed there with what one refugee from Europe had been able to accomplish toward making the Haitian people more self-sufficient. This individual had established, out of his own pocket, a trade school in Port-au-Prince where the natives have been taught handicrafts. As a result, they are now taking in thousands of dollars a year selling the products of that institution to tourists and others. The same thing can be done in the Virgin Islands. Such plans have a way of spreading and taking in others.

As I understand, the bill now before us calls for an appropriation of \$5,000,000. Here we have an opportunity to take a very small gamble with \$15,000, which may in a few years result in our being able to reduce the appropriation for the administration of the Virgin Islands from \$5,000,000 to perhaps four or three million, or even less.

The Virgin Islands were practically self-sustaining during the time they were under the rule of Denmark. It was only when the Americans went in there with all their quirks for reforms, and one thing and another, that the fortunes of the people of the Virgin Islands began to slip downward and downward and downward, until today the living condi-

tions on the islands are practically beyond description. They are appalling. Hogs out in the Corn Belt are better housed and much better fed than many of the unfortunates in the Virgin Islands. Why quibble over \$15,000 when it may result in the saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions over the years?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to my good friend from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to have answered the question that was asked by the author of the amendment a moment ago, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], as to whether or not under the appropriation proposed in the language of the bill, either the \$5,000,000 item or the \$2,000,000 item in the next paragraph, this \$15,000 could be spent by the Administrator for this specific purpose.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that the amendment is offered to the wrong paragraph. It should be offered to the next paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. This may seem to be a trivial matter to some of you, but to me it involves the welfare of many thousands. It involves the well-being of the people of the Virgin Islands, and therefore I am very much interested. Their welfare should be close to our hearts.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. This is not the place to offer that amendment. It should be offered to the next paragraph, and it should provide that of the \$2,000,000 that is available for the field service \$15,000 should be available exclusively for this study in the Virgin Islands. Then you would have a chance to get it done. If you should tie it into a paragraph where it does not belong, it can be spent only in the Department down here and cannot be made effective. I should like to see it made effective, instead of fooling away our time on it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman draft language that will permit the expenditure of \$10,000 or \$15,000 or whatever is necessary?

Mr. TABER. I have done so. That would be agreeable to me; but I would hate to see it done in a way that would not be effective.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am not interested in the parliamentary situation, but I am intensely interested in what can be done to help the Virgin Islanders who need our help to make themselves self-sufficient.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I say to the gentleman that a new amendment is at the Clerk's desk putting the amendment in its proper place.

Mr. KNUTSON. I shall not take any more of the Committee's time, except to express the earnest hope that we will at long last take some steps toward alleviating the deplorable conditions that exist in the Virgin Islands and which are yearly becoming worse. Let us not shirk our responsibility. After all, we are our brother's keeper in this instance.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I have offered be withdrawn, and the substitute amendment offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Has the Clerk read the paragraph on the field office service?

The CHAIRMAN. It will be necessary for the Clerk to read the next paragraph and then the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan may be offered.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk on that same paragraph.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] asked unanimous consent that he be permitted to withdraw his amendment, and he offered a substitute amendment. I wonder if that is the status of the situation at the present time and what is the substitute amendment and to what section might it apply?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] expects to offer is on a paragraph that has not yet been read.

Mr. HARRIS. Then it would not be a substitute amendment, I would assume.

The CHAIRMAN. That is also the understanding of the Chair.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Field office service: For expenses necessary to operate and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices for the collection and dissemination of information useful in the development and improvement of commerce throughout the United States and its possessions, including not to exceed \$90,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, \$2,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 52, line 20, strike out "\$90,000" and insert "\$110,000"; and on line 21, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$5,190,000."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, business is the lifeblood of this Nation. If business prospers there will be full employment, stable economy, a higher standard of living for more and more people—and the opportunity to reduce our national debt will grow accordingly. Anything we can do to help business help itself represents a measure of economy for this Government.

And business is eager to help itself. During the month of March 128,000 letters, phone calls and personal visits from businessmen flooded into the 78 field offices of the Department of Commerce. That is 128,000 in a single month, mind you. So what does the majority of the Appropriations Committee of this House propose? It proposes to wipe out one-half of these points where businessmen, and especially small businessmen, may contact the rich store of marketing facts which the United States Government has available for them through the Department of Commerce.

Unless the majority Members of this House come to the rescue of American business, 39 Department of Commerce offices will be closed. I would like to read you the list of the cities which will lose their offices if this House does not come to the rescue, and as I read this list I want you to remember that each of these cities is a center for wide areas of business which are as much affected as the cities themselves:

Birmingham, Ala.; Phoenix, Ariz.; Little Rock, Ark.; San Diego, Calif.; New Haven, Conn.; Boise, Idaho; Peoria, Ill.; Evansville, Ind.; Des Moines, Iowa; Wichita, Kans.; Portland, Maine; Worcester, Mass.; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Duluth, Minn.; Jackson, Miss.; Butte, Mont.; Fremont, Nebr.; Reno, Nev.; Manchester, N. H.; Albuquerque, N. Mex.; Albany, Rochester, Syracuse, N. Y.—

Mr. Chairman, I realize that I may sound like a train announcer, but at least this pause which the Members seem to be enjoying gives them an opportunity to realize just exactly what I am saying and to fully understand which offices are going to be closed as the result of the action taken by the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman contemplate that reading the list of offices to be closed will so frighten everyone that we will vote for his amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. It might help.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, a reading of the list will be of great interest to the people of the country and those areas where the offices are abolished, as another piece of evidence of what constitutes false economy.

Mr. ROONEY. Most certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to my friend.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand one of those offices is located in Indianapolis. I do not know whether the gentleman has read that place or not, but I understand the people who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of this Federal expenditure in Indianapolis do not want the office. They want to get along without it, and they will.

Mr. ROONEY. How about the people in Evansville?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. Do you believe that by reading that list you will scare a lot of Members in voting for your amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. I have already answered that. Now, if I may be permitted to continue.

Mr. RICH. We are going to have more backbone than that.

Mr. ROONEY. I assure the gentleman I can hear him

Fargo, N. Dak.; Columbus and Toledo, Ohio; Erie and Scranton, Pa.; Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Chattanooga and Nashville, Tenn.; San Antonio and Texarkana, Tex.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Burlington, Vt.; Norfolk, Va.; Spokane, Wash.; Charleston, W. Va.; and Cheyenne, Wyo.

The services which business, and particularly small business, has demanded of the Department of Commerce through its field offices this year required an appropriation of \$5,190,000. Our Appropriations Committee has recommended that this figure be cut to \$2,000,000, a reduction of 62 percent. It is incredible to me that the committee cannot see that marketing and other aids which business would receive through the expenditure of the \$3,190,000 which it is proposed we refuse to appropriate would not be worth many times that amount to the American economy and therefore, in part, to the Treasury of the United States.

It is also incredible to me that the suggestion of this false economy comes in a period of our history when American business is readjusting itself to normalcy after the tremendous disruptions caused by the war and is in need of all the information that it can possibly obtain.

Furthermore, I want to point out that there is a tremendous difference between service in one spot and service on the spot. Businessmen should not have to take time to go to Washington or travel to a distant field office to get their facts and marketing data; and small businessmen, let us remember, cannot afford to do it. Time and money is too valuable to them. They should expect service reasonably near their places of business and as localized as possible to the situation in their particular city. They have a right to expect regional studies to aid them in their immediate marketing areas.

I fail to see why we should spend the money we feel well justified in spending to gather material the Federal Government can gather in the field of business and marketing information at home and abroad and then refuse to spend a matter of \$3,000,000 more to see that it is

widely and properly available and adapted to the use of specific areas.

If each field office is responsible for saving but one business in its trade center, then I submit that its existence, and the expenditure involved in its maintenance, is justified.

It is my firm opinion that the Department should be given every cent that it requested.

Businesswise there are critical times—pay rolls are pointed downward, business turn-over is less, and there are rumors of buyers' strikes all over the country. The businessman, especially the small businessman, needs help and encouragement, not a slap in the face such as that proposed in the pending bill.

The Department has been criticized for nursing business. Well, if the number of business failures can be reduced by nursing or by any other form of aid, then I am for it. I therefore propose that we give the Department funds to maintain all of the field offices now open, and more money to open more offices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] for 3 minutes to close debate.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is that businessmen will not be required to come to Washington if the Committee stands fast with its Subcommittee on Appropriations on these field offices. The fact of the matter is the Bureau of the Budget at one time, not very long ago, requested the liquidation of all of these field offices. It was this committee that saved them. At one time they had only 23 field offices. They were operated very efficiently in my opinion. They had an appropriation of \$350,000. We are allowing \$2,000,000 for 40 offices.

Carlton Hayward, the Director of the Field Office Service, and Joe Mack I have known for a long time. I have discussed this matter with them pro and con. I have visited many many of these field offices personally. They do not object to the action of this committee.

My very very dear friend, the gentleman from New York, read a list of cities and towns. I may say to him that I have here in my hand letters from many of those places, both large and small, commending the committee on its action. I have one from Indianapolis, about which the majority leader was talking. This one is from the chamber of commerce thanking the committee for discontinuing the office at Indianapolis. I have other letters of a similar nature from cities and towns, large and small, asking us to discontinue them and give the chambers of commerce in the various localities a chance to give the businessmen a little service without interference on the part of these people.

The directors of the field offices here in Washington will be very very happy if the action of this committee is approved by the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. MITCHELL. In answer to the question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] about Evansville, let me say that we do not want it in Evansville. I represent Evansville.

Mr. STEFAN. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the other amendment which I offered may be read at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: On page 52, line 21, strike out the period, insert a comma and the following: "Of which \$15,000 shall be available exclusively for the study of economic conditions in the Virgin Islands."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan seek recognition?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, throughout the years I have served in this body there has developed a strong feeling of respect for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]. The reason for that respect is demonstrated by his very generous action today in thinking of the unfortunate people of the Virgin Islands and in offering an amendment out of which may come some good. The amount involved is negligible, but the moral uplift as the result of the adoption of the amendment will be great in conveying to the people of those islands the fact that they are not completely forgotten by the people of the United States.

I was very much impressed by the remarks made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON]. He, I, and other members of the Committee on Ways and Means well know from service on that committee of the trying economic conditions that exist in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

This amendment is confined to the Virgin Islands.

My purpose in rising was to add my weak voice to express the hope that the amendment will be adopted, and to support the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

The people in those islands, the same as every other person, were not consulted as to where they were born. We were fortunate to have been born in America. The fact is they were not consulted when they were born in the Virgin Islands.

The Virgin Islands is one of our continental possessions and we owe an obligation to the people of those islands. The message that this action will convey to the people there is far greater

than the amount involved. The results that may flow from it can be of tremendous value to the people of the Virgin Islands. This is for a survey, a field study, and I hope the recommendations might result in the establishment of new businesses down there, in showing the people down there how they might develop and utilize in a business way some of the natural resources of the Virgin Islands. In all the contents of this bill I am more touched by this amendment than I am with any other provision of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The remarks made by the gentleman merely confirm what I have known for years, that he has a big heart that always goes out to unfortunates. The gentleman knows that the condition of the Virgin Islanders has become progressively worse ever since we took them over.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. KNUTSON. While they were under the control of Denmark they were in pretty fair shape; at least, the old-timers down there tell us that that is the situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Correct. I just wanted to make a few remarks so that the RECORD will show the unanimity on both sides of the aisle to the amendment, and that the message to the people of the Virgin Islands will strengthen them, and to express the hope that whoever the Department of Commerce sends down there will appreciate the intent of the House and do everything possible with this amount of money to try and increase the business activities of the islands. If more money is necessary I have no hesitancy in expressing the opinion that the Congress will make the additional appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PATENT OFFICE

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and the salary of the Commissioner at \$10,000 per annum; temporary services as authorized by the Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$75 per diem (not to exceed \$50,000); expenses of transporting to foreign governments publications of patents issued by the Patent Office; defense of suits instituted against the Commissioner of Patents; travel; production by photolithographic process of copies of weekly issue of drawings of patents and designs, reproduction of copies and drawings and specifications of exhausted patents, designs, trade-marks, foreign patent drawings, and other papers, such other papers when reproduced for sale to be sold at such prices as determined by the Commissioner; photo prints of pending application drawings; and other contingent and miscellaneous expenses of the Patent Office: *Provided*, That the headings of the drawings for patented cases may be multigraphed in the Patent Office for the purpose of photolithography: \$8,000,000.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 53, lines 10 and 11, as follows:

Such other papers when reproduced for sale to be sold at such prices as determined by the Commissioner—

That sentence is legislation on an appropriation bill and unauthorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I refer the Chairman to the language appearing in the hearings on page 283. The Chairman very kindly requested the department to furnish the information. That language refers to the production or printing in the department and does not justify the fees for this printing. The Chairman was alert and attempted to raise this question, but the insertion later did not give the law that authorizes this expenditure.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, of course I will have to concede the point of order. I know the gentleman fears that perhaps these words "and other papers" will give the Patent Office the right to charge more than 20 cents for papers. By authority of law the Patent Office is not going to increase the price of those papers they must get out for the attorneys, and so forth.

This refers to other papers, the kind they have no knowledge of what they are going to have. There might be none at all. I wish the gentleman would withdraw his point of order.

Mr. CHURCH. I cannot, Mr. Chairman, withdraw my point of order. I insist on my point of order.

Mr. STEFAN. We concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ARENDS: Page 52, line 25, after the semicolon strike out the word "temporary", down to and including "\$50,000" in line 3, page 53.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very plain. It has but one purpose, namely, to clear out the \$75 per day so-called experts that the Department down there wishes to have in the Patent Office. I think it is well to understand certain things that have gone on over in the Patent Office, which I have become acquainted with while serving with the Patent Committee, and some things I have learned since that time. I would like to call your attention to some of the practices occurring down there to emphasize that these experts are not needed at all. The so-called experts that can help down in the Patent Office are already there.

The Congress is concerned today with the Federal budget for 1948, and well may it be concerned because the total expenditures for operating the Government have exceeded its receipts so long and by

such huge amounts as to cause the public debt to reach a sum so fantastic as to arouse grave fears in the minds of many businessmen and economists that the country is on the verge of national bankruptcy. Unless we can balance the budget and balance it quickly, it is my view that we might as well prepare ourselves for economic chaos.

No useful purpose would be subserved by narrating how, during the free-spending years preceding the war, the adoption of the New Deal policy of tax and tax and spend and spend and spend, the public debt rapidly rose to a sum which theretofore was undreamed of and became a heavy tax burden on every wage earner in America. Expenditures during the war have multiplied that burden so that today the future earnings of workers yet unborn have been mortgaged for generations to come. I say to you that unless this orgy of spending is stopped and public expenditures brought within the receipts immediately, we will have failed in our duty as legislators and as protectors of the public interest.

The current budget presented to the Congress does not measure expenses by income expected to be received, although it was presented to the Congress as the minimum amount on which the Government could effectively operate. It will be my purpose to endeavor to show that such is not the case, and in doing so I will use the Department of Commerce as an example. At the outset, however, I desire to emphasize that what I am about to say is not intended as any reflection on the Secretary of Commerce. He is a new appointee, and I feel sure that he is not familiar with all of the details which I will mention or to which I will advert. Nevertheless, his entire budget is such, in my judgment, as to cast suspicion on it in its entirety.

Considering the personnel items of that Department, they have been increased by the addition of surplus employees to such an extent and on such a scale and in such circumstances as to furnish good grounds for the conclusion that the policy has been deliberately adopted of providing havens of refuge for deserving New Dealers. We will consider, first, the Patent Office. I was a member of the House Patents Committee for many years and am somewhat familiar with the operations of that Office.

The executive officers of the Patent Office provided for by statute are the Commissioner, the Assistant Commissioner, and the Chief Clerk, the latter who is by law required to be qualified as a principal examiner. The Commissioner and Assistant Commissioner are Presidential appointees.

In utter disregard of the will of Congress, a perpetual Assistant Commissioner has been appointed, by transfer into the Office of a person for whom was created a new job known as executive officer. The salary of this person is that of an Assistant Commissioner, \$8,180 per annum. Similarly, the financial officer, who is a career employee, has been moved out of his office to do the Chief Clerk's work for the purpose of making room for another transferee.

The personnel work of the Patent Office was always performed by three em-

ployees, the maximum salary of whom did not exceed \$3,000 per annum. Now, since January 1, 1944, there are approximately 24 of them, the salaries of some of them being:

Chief personnel officer.....	\$7,102
Employment relations officer.....	6,384
Personnel technician.....	5,208
Four classification analysts.....	14,000

There should also be included in the personnel division 8 to 10 stenographers, 2 of whom are in grade 7 at \$3,397.20 per annum, and 2 in grade 5 at \$2,644.80 per annum.

There has been created in that Office a new division consisting of nontechnical employees known as the Management Planning and Budget Division, consisting of 11 employees at a cost of \$50,181 per annum. This Division has planned nothing more than how to keep their own jobs and create others for persons who were to lose or did lose their wartime jobs.

Last, but not least, and included in the above, there has been created in the Patent Office, as a part of the Management Division, a Budget Section headed by a budget officer at \$6,384 per annum, an assistant budget officer at \$5,153 and two stenographers at high salaries. The budget work of that office, before this so-called reorganization plan was put into effect, was done by the financial clerk in his spare time and at that it never took him over 2 weeks in any calendar year. All of these new jobs were created under Henry Wallace when he had authority to create them.

The same procedure was followed not only in the office of the Secretary but also in the other bureaus of the Commerce Department. In the Bureau of Standards alone, I am reliably informed, that 12 rooms have been taken over to accommodate this horde of surplus employees.

Perhaps the prize exhibit of them all is the National Inventors Council. That agency was organized during the war to receive and evaluate inventive suggestions submitted by the public. It was, strictly a wartime agency and operated on a budget of about \$150,000 per annum. Instead of closing up shop after the war, it was renamed as the "Office of Technical Services," its force was greatly increased and the salaries of all technical employees multiplied so that they are truly among the elect from a salary standpoint. This was done by the usual expedient of reclassifying jobs and by creating new jobs.

One of the jobs that agency is supposed to perform is to conduct scientific research.

Former Secretary Wallace tried to have enacted into law S. 1248 during the last Congress which would have enabled him to blanket the country with employees of his own selection and conduct scientific research. That bill never became law, but undaunted, the Secretary issued an order authorizing such research and promulgated rules and regulations for the guidance of employees of the Office of Technical Services who are engaged on that work. Such order and rules are published in the Federal Register. Thus, it will be seen that the work is conducted despite express au-

thorization by Congress and not because of it. There is no authority of law whatever for this activity. By abolishing it, \$1,700,000 would be saved to the taxpayers. This section of the bill has just been stricken from the bill on a point of order.

I think I have said enough to demonstrate the manner in which unnecessary employees have been included in the present budget. First, there have been employed for the first time budget officers in the bureaus and the Budget Bureau itself has been greatly overexpanded, to insure that jobs would be created in a strictly proper way and, second, the personnel groups have been greatly increased to insure that the job classification of the surplus employees would be presented in such manner as to insure the payment of the maximum salaries available. My thought is to wipe them all out.

My suggestion is to restore the personnel of the Government to what it was on January 1, 1944.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Did the Commissioner ask for any of those people, and has he said that any of them are of a bit of use to him?

Mr. ARENDS. Not that I know of.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike out the item of \$75 per diem for technical and expert advice to the Patent Office. The Commissioner of Patents, Mr. Ooms, came before us and made a very good case for this. He indicated he needs it and needs it badly, and we believe he does because it will save litigation and it will save money. The Patent Office has been down in Richmond, Va., and just recently moved back to Washington. We know the backlog there. Patent attorneys have complained against it. We went into the item very carefully. I feel that this amendment would cripple the effort on the part of the Patent Office to catch up with the backlog and eliminate the condition. It would cost the Government money if you would eliminate these experts. Some of the patent problems are very technical, so technical that it is absolutely necessary to employ technical experts occasionally. I urge that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us how many applications are in arrears at the present time?

Mr. STEFAN. There is a tremendous backlog. If the gentleman will refer to the hearings he can find full information about it. I think there is a backlog of about 40,000 applications. They are catching up with them more rapidly in view of the fact that they have moved here from Richmond. The Richmond office resulted in a tremendous backlog of patents during the war. Necessarily we had to move the office there to make room for war agencies.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Can the gentleman answer the question in which I am interested, whether the Commissioner really wants them there? Has the gentleman taken that point up with him?

Mr. STEFAN. We certainly have taken it up with him.

Mr. OWENS. What did he say?

Mr. STEFAN. He indicated that he needs these experts very badly in order to get the expert advice the Patent Office must have. We think he is absolutely right.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I am in thorough accord with the contention of the gentleman from Nebraska, and I ask that this amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were—ayes 49, noes 80.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 67, line 19, after the amount "\$350,000" and before the period, insert "together with \$465,000 to be derived from the referees' salary fund established in pursuance of said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. STEFAN: On page 67, line 26, after the amount "\$350,000" and before the period, insert "together with \$325,000 to be derived from the referees' expense fund established in pursuance of the act of June 28, 1946, Public Law 464."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 66, after line 17, insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, \$1,833,500: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the

main (CAF-4), senior (CAF-5), or principal (CAF-6) clerical grade, or assistant (CAF-7) or associate (CAF-8) administrative grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the junior (P-1), assistant (P-2), associate (P-3), full (P-4), or senior (P-5) professional grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed \$6,500 per annum, except in the case of the senior circuit judge of each circuit and senior district judge of each district having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed \$7,500."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Nebraska reserve his point of order?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to reserve the point of order.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, the complete elimination of this item for miscellaneous salaries in the judiciary is the most glaring example of senseless economy in this bill. This is the instance where the majority raises a point of order in regard to an annual appropriation that is vitally necessary for the conduct and proper functioning of our Federal district and circuit courts. The requested sum of \$1,833,500 is the same amount as allowed in the present fiscal year, plus the increases mandatory under Public Law 390, is for the payment of the small salaries of the secretaries and law clerks to the Federal judges throughout this country. There are about 113 Federal judges to whom are allowed in most instances \$6,500 under a plan the same as clerk hire used to be allowed in that amount to Members of Congress and to the extent of \$7,500 per annum in a few instances for the offices of senior circuit judges and senior district judges.

Is it good economy to say to the Federal judiciary: "You are now going to perform your functions without even a law clerk or secretary. You cannot have a secretary or clerk. You are going to have to write your official correspondence in longhand and you are going to have no help whatever in getting your important written opinions together and in carrying on the rest of the work of your court."

I rise at this time to offer this amendment to show the senseless economy which has been practiced in the entire important appropriation bill which we are now about to conclude. I trust that the proper legislative committee will promptly rectify this outrage.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROONEY. No, Mr. Chairman; I must concede the point of order. There is no authorization in law for this expenditure, although it has been in this bill year after year for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 99 words.

I ask for this time simply to call to the attention of the House the fact that the Judiciary Committee has, in accordance with the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee, prepared and approved a bill which is now on the calendar of this House to correct this situation, so that none of the untoward results will obtain in the future.

We beg that this action of the Judiciary Committee may be sustained at the earliest possible moment, in accordance with the report of our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHENOWETH: On page 65, line 1, after the word "Washington", strike out the words "Pueblo, Colo."

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, my amendment removes the city of Pueblo, Colo., from the list of places contained in this bill which are prohibited from receiving any of the funds appropriated in this bill to pay the cost of maintaining an office of the clerk of the United States District Court.

It has been the practice for several years to include in this annual appropriation bill a large number of towns and cities in such a list, but this year some new names have been added. I would be glad to have the chairman of the committee explain just why Pueblo, Colo., is included in this list.

Mr. STEFAN. I will tell you why. It is because we cannot discriminate one from the other. All of those mentioned in the bill have had less than 50 cases during the past two succeeding years, and we cannot discriminate one from the other. The fact of the matter is that this came to us on the recommendation of many of those who are interested in eliminating some of these offices which have had so little to do, for the sake of economy.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Do you not ordinarily leave that decision up to the United States district judge to determine whether or not he needs a clerk in certain offices?

Mr. STEFAN. I am sure the judicial council will approve of what we have done.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that Pueblo is the second largest city in the State of Colorado, with a population of about 80,000. It is 120 miles from the city of Denver, where the only other clerk's office in the State of Colorado is located. I think the gentleman recognizes that business in the Federal courts fluctuates. Courts will have a

small number of cases in one year, and a larger number the next year. No one can predict what the future volume will be.

Mr. STEFAN. The court continues its docket there.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I understand, but there will be no clerk there. I maintain that a city of the size of Pueblo should have a clerk of the district court, for the convenience of citizens desiring to do business with the court. I might state that this office also serves all of southern Colorado.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. GARY. There were 19 of these offices knocked out because during the years 1945 and 1946 not a single one of those offices had as many as 50 cases in either of those years. It so happens that two of those places were in Virginia. We are losing those two offices in Virginia.

Mr. CHENOWETH. What was the size of those places?

Mr. GARY. One was Charlottesville and the other was Bigstone Gap.

Mr. CHENOWETH. What is the population of those cities?

Mr. GARY. It was not a question of population.

Mr. CHENOWETH. What is the area covered?

Mr. GARY. It is a question of the number of cases that went through the courts. Less than 50 cases went through the courts.

The maintenance of these 19 offices cost the Government \$33,000, for those few cases.

Let me say to the gentleman that if he is going to restore Pueblo I certainly will offer an amendment to restore Charlottesville and Big Stone Gap.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not know anything about the gentleman's situation in Virginia but I do know our situation in Colorado. The only clerks of the district court in Colorado are in Denver and Pueblo. Colorado is a rather large State, and covers quite an area. The adoption of the committee amendment means that the people of Colorado will have to go to Denver to transact all their business in the United States district court?

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. As I understand, we have an advisory council in the Supreme Court headed by Mr. Chandler. Would not the proper way be to make inquiry as to whether or not they have made such a recommendation? The distinguished gentleman from Colorado may be right in his claim.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I do not know what the procedure is. The committee has not explained upon whose recommendation this action is being taken.

Mr. OWENS. That is the procedure.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I cannot understand the attitude of the committee and I most emphatically protest against including Pueblo, a city of 80,000 people, in the list of those places which are de-

nied an office of the clerk of the district court.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that a city of the size and importance of Pueblo is entitled to have the services of a clerk of the district court.

I urge that my amendment be adopted. The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee went into this matter very carefully after discussing it with Mr. Chandler, the Administrator, and some of the judges who appeared before us. Here are some places where there are only 50 or fewer cases a year. That has been the record for the past consecutive 2 years.

For the sake of economy, I urge that this amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, there being no further amendments, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CURRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 938) entitled "An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein certain telegrams and messages.

Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he

made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein certain telegrams.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Pittsburgh Catholic.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the United States Air Services in tribute to Lieutenant General Eaker. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$230.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include three editorials and an advertisement appearing in the Washington Post.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include telegrams and letters.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 176, Rept. No. 388), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and for such purposes the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 212, Rept. No. 389), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 49, to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Lands printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

COMPLETION OF VETERANS' TEMPORARY REUSE HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 199 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2780) to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes." That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order H. R. 2780, to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes." This

is an open rule and provides for 2 hours' general debate.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there is much controversy about this bill. It will be recalled that in 1945 we authorized the reuse of quite a number of temporary units for veterans and their immediate families, principally in connection with the colleges and universities. At one time it was estimated that they would provide about 200,000 units. Because of the increase in cost of construction they had to cut that program back, and it has been cut back further, so that when the stop order went through, due more or less, I believe, to the fact that they did not have the authorization in terms of dollars to complete the program, the President sent a message to Congress asking for \$50,000,000 to complete what has become known as the Lanham reuse program.

There are involved 12,030 units. The committee decided that it would not authorize the completion of 3,730 of the 12,000 units on which less than 10 percent of the work had been done. So, figuring out mathematically that that amounted to something over \$14,000,000, we reduced the amount of the authorization to complete this program from \$50,000,000, as requested by the President, to \$35,000,000, and then provided \$500,000 to reimburse the colleges and the States, counties, and municipalities for the moneys which they had advanced in connection with these 3,730 units upon which no further work is to be done.

So the bill provides an authorization for \$35,500,000 to complete the Lanham reuse program, and it will make available about 8,300 units.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I understand that there was allocated to every one of these projects an amount sufficient to complete them, but because of the way the thing was handled by the contractors, and the things that were charged up to the jobs, they were not completed; that if it had been done in a businesslike way, and honestly done, every single one of those jobs could have been completed within the allocation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There was no testimony before the committee that there was any dishonesty with respect to the projects, but there was a great deal of testimony that the increase in the cost of construction of the projects made it necessary to stop them because they did not have money enough to build them. Now, this \$35,000,000 is necessary if these 8,300 units are to be completed. It is necessary primarily because of the increase in construction costs.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. With reference to the remarks of the gentleman from New York, whatever inefficiency there may have been in the picture, the fact

does remain that the cost of material and labor has materially increased since this original appropriation was made. The further fact is that there is a great necessity for additional temporary housing. I am thinking now particularly of parts of California, especially southern California, where there is inadequate housing for thousands of these veterans. In Los Angeles County alone there are on file requests for some 15,000 housing units. They had to shut off the requests after they got 15,000 of them. How many additional thousands there may be we do not know. The proportionate share we will get of this \$35,000,000 will supply only about 1,000 more units to take care of a demand of 15,000. I think it is very vital and necessary.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say that this is probably the lowest-cost housing of any the Government has constructed. The average unit cost, other than the land acquisition and development, is \$2,771, as opposed to the present average of something over \$5,000. That is relatively low-cost housing.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will this legislation enable the universities and colleges that had to curtail because of the lack of funds due to increased cost of labor and the like to carry on their programs to take care of veteran students?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Generally speaking, that is correct. On page 19 of the hearings there is a table of all of these projects, showing where they are located, so in order to determine definitely whether any particular college will be benefited, reference should be made to that table. Perhaps they have a project on which more than 10 percent of construction has taken place. If so, that project will be completed and made available for GI students.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The University of Minnesota, under contract with the Government, has completed or is completing some units. It had put some \$60,000 for additional units. Then suddenly they were ordered to stop construction. I understand this allows completion of all units that are 10 percent completed. If there are some units that are not 10 percent completed, what provision is there for such?

Mr. WOLCOTT. If 10 percent of the construction has not been completed, then they would not go ahead with the project, but the university would be reimbursed for any advances they had made.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. Notwithstanding the fact that the project may not be listed in the schedule to which the gentleman has just referred, do I correctly understand that this bill provides that where units

have been constructed under this program more than 10 percent toward completion they will be included in this bill, that there is sufficient money for that purpose?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Those will be completed, but if less than 10 percent of the work has been done they will not be completed. There is a category within this category of 10 percent to which I should call attention; 1,622 of the 3,730 units have had no work whatsoever done on them. The other 2,108 units are in this position; the barracks, we will say, have been dismantled, have been razed, and are available to these projects. Some of that material has been transported to the site. Some of it remains on site in the camp from which it would otherwise be removed. But there has been no work done even to dismantle the old buildings on 1,622 of them, and there has been no actual construction work done on 2,108 of the units. Therefore, we stop that program because, frankly speaking, prices are so high now that to start from scratch on these projects would bring the cost per unit up to something over \$5,000, and the committee thought that was pretty high-cost housing, especially where they were to be put to temporary use only.

Mr. HAND. Where construction has been 10 percent or more advanced to completion, those projects will be completed under the terms of this bill, notwithstanding the list that may appear in the report?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct. The administration, the committee, and the Congress are not bound to complete only the projects named in that list. If there are any projects where 10 percent or more of the work has been done, they will be completed under this program, and the \$35,000,000 is sufficient to complete them notwithstanding the fact that they do not appear on the list.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. With reference to the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota concerning the project at the University of Minnesota, I just want to add that our uncompleted units come within the third category which I will bring out at the time the bill is considered.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say to the gentleman that if that project is in the third category which lists units where more than 11 percent and less than 25 percent of the work has been done, they will be completed. As a matter of fact, if more than 10 percent of the construction has been done the units will be completed.

Mr. MACKINNON. The committee report shows that the third category includes projects where expenditures have been made for unloading, rough grading, utility work, or erection of foundation posts or piers. I understand from the reading of that report if any one of these things has been accomplished they fall in the third category.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If in the aggregate more than 10 percent of the work has been done they will be completed.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. There has been considerable complaint received concerning the inadequacy of subsistence allowances for veterans attending college. Can the gentleman tell me whether the passage of this bill will to some extent relieve that by making cheaper housing available for these veterans at universities?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; I believe it will. It will make available low-cost units for the GI's who are attending universities. The average rental on all of these projects is \$30 a month.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I notice in the report the item totaling \$14,668,499 for completing projects on which no actual construction work has been done has been eliminated.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; because less than 10 percent of the work has been done on them.

Mr. BARRETT. Do I understand that all of the projects, other than those, which amount to about \$35,000,000, will receive the full amounts?

Mr. WOLCOTT. They shall. I might refer the gentleman to the list of projects in the hearings as a guide to whether any particular project he has might or might not be completed under this bill.

Mr. BARRETT. I notice here the three projects in Wyoming are in the 26- to 50-percent category, so they would get the full amount under the \$50,000,000 proposed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Are we to understand that the 12,030 additional units contracted for will use up—and I quote from the report—"all the publicly owned temporary structures, such as military barracks, dormitories, and temporary war housing," or will that aggregate number not use up all of that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Generally speaking, it will use them up.

Mr. JAVITS. So we would appropriate for three-thousand-and-some-odd units less? So when we fail to appropriate for the additional 3,000 units, we are not utilizing all those temporary structures which are available?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think that is substantially correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress I donated a great deal of time and interest to this very matter that is now before us. I remember that early in January the mayors of the various cities in the United States met here in Washington and passed a unanimous resolution setting forth the plight in which they found themselves and in which the veteran found himself.

As a result of that, I waited and watched with keen interest hoping some action would be taken immediately. After a period of 30 days, nothing having happened I then began conferring with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] my minority leader, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] as well as other leaders of the Democratic Party. I am happy to report I received their full cooperation and they deserve the full credit for bringing the matter to the personal attention of the President of the United States, who in turn, recognizing the importance, the emergency nature of the problem, submitted forthwith a message to this Congress requesting that we take the action which is set forth in the present legislation.

Two days later, on March 3, I introduced H. R. 2340 which contains the identical provisions of the bill now before us. I am deeply appreciative that the committee has now come out with this bill. It is of vital importance to the municipalities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can vouch for the statement that the gentleman has made—that he has been constantly in contact with those in position on the minority side in connection with the veterans' housing. The gentleman has personally spoken to me on at least a dozen occasions. The people of his district, and particularly the veterans, are to be congratulated on the very vigilant manner in which the gentleman from Colorado has been looking after their interests.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

I take no personal pride in the authorship of this particular bill. I am very much pleased that now, for the first time, we have done something toward helping the veteran in the critical housing problem with which he is faced. I believe it should be emphasized, however, that this legislation for temporary housing for veterans, important as it is, is only a drop in the bucket compared with the problem that we should be acting upon.

It has also been gratifying to me that the able, learned, and esteemed Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been ably sponsoring this legislation in the Senate and I am informed it has recently been passed by that body. I sincerely trust that the Members of the House will act expeditiously in this matter as important time has already been lost. I know that the committee has reduced the \$50,000,000 increase in authorization as contained in my original bill to \$35,500,000. I think such a reduction is unwise and will vote in favor of an amendment restoring the original amount of \$50,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule on this side and I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2780) to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes."

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2780, with Mr. McGREGOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Kentucky will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes to answer any further questions which there may be. I think the subject was covered pretty generally in the debate on the rule, but I yield myself 5 minutes for the purpose of answering any further questions.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. As I understand the measure, all these units which are more than 10 percent on the way to completion will be completed with the funds which will be authorized under this measure.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. This is a very fine bill, and is presented in the usual fine form by the gentleman's committee. Can the gentleman tell me when the bill to allow veterans' priority to purchase homes will come out?

Mr. WOLCOTT. A bill, H. R. 3492, was introduced today after several days of open hearings and executive sessions. I assume the gentlewoman refers to the Lanham permanent housing program?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is hoped that we will be able to report that bill out of committee tomorrow, and it is possible that we will be able to take it up next week, although I am not sure about that.

Mr. MacKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MacKINNON. I would like to clarify the meaning of the language under which the completion of suspended units is authorized. This authorization appears in section 2 of the bill. In the committee report, on page 4, you describe six categories of projects.

The second category of projects includes those which are 1 to 10 percent complete. The report states that in these projects only dismantling or dismantling and transportation has been done. That is the same language which appears in the bill in lines 14 and 15.

In dealing with category 3, the report states that this group of projects includes those which are 11 to 25 percent complete; and the report states in addition that it includes unloading, rough grading, some utility work, and erection of foundation piers or posts on the projects.

Now as I consider that language, projects in the third category are considered as authorized under the language of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and it was so intended. Unless the project falls within a category, as has been explained where less than 10 percent of the work has been completed, part of which might represent dismantling or dismantling and transportation, then the project will be completed.

Mr. MacKINNON. And that if any one of the factors of unloading, rough grading, utility work, or the erection of foundation posts or piers has been expended for that the project then falls in the third category?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. Let me further explain that page 4 of the report, subitem 2, explaining this 2,108 units as distinguished from the 1,622 under category 1 means that there has been dismantling or dismantling and transportation; in other words, it means that the barracks or dormitories have been dismantled and perhaps transported to the new site but no construction work has been done in the program; so the other category which the gentleman mentioned, outside of dismantling, or dismantling and transportation, would be we will say credited as work done. If it brings the work done over 10 percent, then the project will be completed.

Mr. MacKINNON. I have particular reference to the project at the University of Minnesota, but there is a disparity between the date of the report, December 14, 1946, and the language of the bill, which has to be April 1, 1947. I understood the committee chairman to state that the effective date, of course, was the language in the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It would have to be, of course.

Mr. MacKINNON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In the section of the bill that provides \$500,000 for reimbursement to cities, counties, and educational institutions, I am wondering if the amount is sufficient. There is a project in my county where the site preparation costs considerable, and there is a balance of unused site which runs into some

\$300,000, which is more than half the amount the bill provides.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is two-hundred-and-some-odd thousand, I believe.

Mr. McDONOUGH. It is \$297,000.

We are so pressed for housing in that section of the State we are certain that this money will be returned to the State, and the site will undoubtedly be used for the building of units that are on the job knocked down but have not gotten into the 10 percent completion category.

We want to be certain that the \$500,000 is sufficient to take care of the entire Nation, including the nearly \$300,000 we are entitled to. I understand the estimates from the FPHA have been so fragmentary and doubtful that there is a question as to whether the \$500,000 will be sufficient.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Within the 10 percent category it was estimated that there were advances made by the colleges and municipalities of \$481,000. We provide that they were not to use more than \$500,000. We gave them the other \$19,000 as further assurance that there would be sufficient authorization to take care of all of them. The gentleman from California (Mr. FLETCHER) is going to offer an amendment to strike out certain language in the bill which would broaden these provisions so that if they did not proceed with the work there would be no question but that the college or municipality which has advanced the money would be reimbursed. So we can be assured that the projects will be completed and thus make available these units to the municipalities or to colleges or they will get the cash back and they may use the cash to build the dormitories or construct any additions. That would bring the bill in conformity with a similar Senate bill that has been passed. The Senate struck that language out. It accomplishes that purpose but gives us a little more latitude or removes any doubt whatsoever that we want to reimburse the municipalities for the advances that they have made.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I had in mind amending that \$500,000 and increasing the amount to \$750,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman called that to my attention and knowing what the gentleman wants to accomplish and checking this against the Senate bill, I think the Senate language will do that and be sure it will be done, so, personally, I have no objection to striking out that restriction. If it is done there should be no question at all but that the municipalities or the colleges will get the units or the cash to build the units.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman mean sufficient for all their demands, outlay, and for site preparation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. They will be reimbursed for what advances they have made unless in consequence of those advances and work that has already been done the project is completed; then, of course, they would get the benefit of it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If the gentleman believes that the Senate bill provides for that, and with the amendment that is going to be offered by a member of the

committee, I will withhold my amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am certain it does. I am sure that is the intent of the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER], a member of the committee, in offering the amendment.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWARD. There are 136 of these units in group 1 and 234 in group 2 in my State. I want to commend the committee for bringing out this legislation because it means a great deal to the veterans, especially the married veterans who are attending units of our universities. We have canvassed every possible way to get funds to complete these units, including donations from businessmen in the towns. The passage of this bill will mean a great deal in completing the units and making them available for the single veterans, and the married veterans in particular, in my State.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I have in my district five colleges and universities vitally interested in this legislation. May I ask the gentleman whether consideration has been given to how the barracks and other temporary structures which are available but will not be used under this program will be put to use for housing in view of the fact that housing is so urgently necessary, despite the expense?

Mr. WOLCOTT. They are being used at the present time. Does the gentleman mean those which have been completed?

Mr. JAVITS. No. I mean the remainder of some 3,000 which will not be taken up should this bill pass. They are simply temporary structures which will not be used under this program. Has the gentleman considered whether they will be put to some use?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know as I understand the gentleman.

Mr. JAVITS. There are some 3,000 units.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There are 3,000 units and they are being used?

Mr. JAVITS. They are not being provided for under this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They must have been provided for under other legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman is excluding them from this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In what way? We are not excluding them if they have been constructed or if they were more than 10 percent constructed.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman said they were available as temporary structures but they would not be moved elsewhere and put up under this bill. The number of 12,000 units has been cut to 9,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is referring to the barracks and dormitories which are now up and which would be dismantled if we went ahead with the whole program.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In that case, I believe, the barracks or the dormitories or whatever the temporary war housing is, would have to be disposed of under the general provisions of the Lanham Act.

Mr. JAVITS. Or under some other act, but not within the confines of this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. I believe that would be inconsistent inasmuch as I know something about the construction game. It costs two and one-half times as much to tear down these barracks and set them up as it would to erect new ones. As far as Quonset huts are concerned, of course, that is a different situation, but as soon as they have served their usefulness I hope they shall be removed, especially in my district.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I wish to commend the gentleman and the committee for the bill, and I have particular reference to that portion which makes possible the reimbursement to educational institutions for expending their own funds and completing units which otherwise would have been suspended due to lack of funds. That particular part of the bill is really significant to us in the State of Connecticut, and we are anxious to see that the University of Connecticut is reimbursed for the funds they have expended for the benefit of the veterans there. I commend the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time on this side, but I merely wish to say that in this legislation it seems to me the faith and credit of the Federal Government is involved. The Federal Government through these agencies has made contracts with various subdivisions agreeing to furnish these houses if the local subdivisions will furnish the land, the streets, sidewalks, and public-utility facilities. I think it is the duty of the Congress to carry out these contracts. The Constitution of the United States provides that no State shall pass any law impairing the obligation of contracts, and certainly that high degree of fidelity to contract that is imposed on the States should apply to the National Government.

I do not think we have anything to do but carry out the contracts that have been made with these subdivisions. This is an emergency measure, but those that decide whether the emergency exists are the representatives not of the Federal Government but of the local subdivisions. They decide whether they want these

houses or not. I think they will serve a very useful purpose at this time. They will provide the colleges with facilities for taking care of the overflow. Many of the cities know their needs, and have asked that they have the privilege of having these houses, which are owned by the Government and could not be used for any other purposes unless they were transported to the place where they would be of greatest use and erected there.

The title to the personal property, that is, the buildings after they are torn down still remains in the Government. I wish we could all have permanent housing, but under the emergency that exists, the emergency that will be declared by the local subdivisions, this is a very useful program and one that I think will help tide over the great need for housing at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the temporary reuse program under title 5 of the Lanham Act has made a very significant contribution to the amount of rental housing for veterans and their families at rentals they can afford to pay during the past year.

The President in transmitting a request for additional appropriations makes the following observations:

Under this program, Army barracks and other military or civilian wartime structures are converted into temporary dwellings. Many of these are reused on their sites; others are moved and set up on the campuses of universities for the use of student veterans. Still others have been placed on new sites in cities where the housing shortage is desperate.

These educational institutions, municipalities, and other public bodies have used their own funds to provide sites for these temporary reuse homes. In many cases, also, they have provided the necessary utilities. The Federal Government, through the Congress, made two appropriations, totaling \$445,627,000, to finance its part of this program.

Originally, it was planned to convert war structures into 200,000 temporary units under this program. This would, of course, have provided accommodations for many more than 200,000 persons. Rising costs of labor and building materials, as well as rising costs caused by the increased time required for completion due to shortages, have made it necessary for the Government several times during the past year to cut back the temporary reuse program.

Prior to February 1, 1947, allocations had been made for 158,834 units, but the rising costs of building and the scarcity of materials made it necessary recently to suspend 8,357 of these. With cut-backs, which had been ordered earlier, it now appears that it will be possible, out of Federal appropriations, to provide for only about 150,000 units or approximately 25 percent fewer than was planned. Of these 95,451 units have been completed and around 55,000, including suspended units, are under construction.

No more allocations out of the funds available under the Lanham Act can be made. Prior to the time cut-backs and suspensions were ordered, as a result of the approaching exhaustion of funds, however, many local groups such as city governments and educational institutions, already had obligated or spent considerable funds of their own as required under the Lanham Act. This was done to acquire sites, provide utilities or community facilities to accommodate the

housing which they confidently expected would be set up. In some instances they also spent funds on a reimbursable basis, to provide utilities and perform other necessary work in connection with these houses. When it became obvious that some temporary reuse units could not be completed at Federal expense, many local bodies set aside funds of their own in order to bring these units to completion.

The President asks for further appropriation by the Congress of \$50,000,000. The committee has recommended unanimously \$35,500,000 to fulfill its contractual obligations.

These obligations fall into four categories:

First. Completion of all units now under contract, including approximately 8,357 units suspended since December 14, 1946.

Second. Completion of approximately 4,869 units which were canceled in previous cut-backs.

Third. Reimbursement of public bodies for expenditures of their own funds for the completion of approximately 400 units which otherwise would have been canceled.

Fourth. Reimbursement of public bodies for the cost of utility and other on-site work performed by them in connection with veterans' temporary housing on a reimbursable basis.

The Federal Government must carry out contractual obligations accepted in good faith by educational institutions, municipalities and other local bodies.

It is recommended, by the committee therefore, that the authorization contained in section 502 (d) of the Lanham Act be increased by \$35,500,000 and that the funds subsequently appropriated under the increased authorization be available to meet the four obligations specified above.

Over and above these contractual obligations, we have obvious responsibilities to those who served their country in the armed forces. Under our program about half of the temporary reuse housing is made available to colleges and other institutions of learning to house veterans while they are studying under the terms of the GI bill of rights. The other housing is set up in crowded cities, where otherwise many of our returned servicemen would be unable to find accommodations. Rentals of these temporary structures average \$30 per family unit. I am sure I do not need to stress the urgency of the completion of this program to alleviate the stringent housing shortage faced by so many of our veterans.

In the city of Pittsburgh, provision was made for 750 emergency homes for veterans. The program is still 75 units short of the 750 contemplated and contracted for in March 1946. Of those erected only about one-half are ready for occupancy. Those completed are now housing 376 families.

I urge the Congress to support the committee's recommendation and carry out our obligations to the veterans.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the merits of the program, I think this is a solemn contract

between the Government and the municipalities of this country, and between the Government and the colleges of this country. I feel that they ought to carry out these contracts. They are serving a useful purpose, and the main purpose is to get homes for the returning veterans of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1572 (a)), is amended by striking out "\$410,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof "\$460,000,000."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$460,000,000" and insert "\$445,500,000."

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RILEY to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 8, strike out "\$445,500,000" and insert "\$454,000,000."

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 2780, as reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency would authorize the appropriation of funds to complete all suspended units covered by remittent contract with educational institutions and local agencies except those on which the Government has expended no funds, an estimated 1,622 units, and those on which the Government expenditures have been incurred only in dismantling or transportation, an estimated 2,108 units. This amendment would restore the funds for those 2,108 units. There is still no provision for the 1,622 units.

These 2,108 housing units have been dismantled. Parts of them are in one place and parts in another. The various colleges and communities have prepared the land and provided the utilities—on the sites—they have made their plans to use these houses. The housing, which this amendment would provide, is largely for the use of veterans who wish to complete their education at either high school or college. With the married veterans, time is of the essence. They have to obtain their education now or forego the opportunity. They cannot wait a year or 2 years or 3 years, because their increasing family responsibilities will necessitate their going into gainful employment.

In addition to the expense of providing sites, the colleges and schools have made plans for the increase of their facilities in order to take care of these men. It is not merely a question of reimbursing them for the money they have expended in the actual preparation of the land and providing the utilities, they have had to make plans to increase classroom facilities, engage additional instructors, and program their courses.

Under the GI bill of rights we made provision for these boys to have an education, yet we turn to them and say, "You cannot have it because you have

no place to live." The married veteran today under the amount that is allowed him to go to school can barely get by. Under this housing you will be giving him adequate housing at an average cost, as testified, of \$30 a month. I should like to know where else he could get a house for \$30 a month to live in and go to school. I do not see why we should mislead these veterans and say that we will give them an education and then turn around on the other hand and say, "You cannot have it because we will not provide you a place to live."

The 1,622 units that have not been dismantled might be used for some other purpose, but those that have been torn down and transported, the Government having paid for that, should be utilized and put into effect for these veterans.

All of you who have had any experience in demolishing houses and rebuilding them realize that the material is worth almost the cost of tearing them down and transporting them to the new place. I want to know if you are going to throw away all this material that is so scarce—electric wiring, plumbing, and other building materials—and then reimburse the cities for the utilities and the streets, and just let the unfinished buildings stand as monuments to contracts broken by the Government.

I hope the amendment will be adopted and that 2,108 additional veterans will be provided the means of going to school and obtaining an education. Perhaps 2,108 others can go the next year, and the year after. This will pyramid into several thousand veterans getting an education. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] to increase the funds in this legislation because I am fearful that we cannot fulfill the Government's contract with many communities on the amount approved by the committee.

In several cities in my congressional district there are unfinished veterans' temporary-housing projects—not because the local community did not meet its end of the deal but because they were caught in a curtailment of the Nationwide program when the original appropriation was exhausted. I want these projects to be completed.

Without increasing this appropriation many communities will suffer. It may be that in my own district the projects are far enough advanced to qualify in category 3, listed in table 11 in the committee's report, and I believe that they will, but I am thinking primarily of the veteran and I want to see him get the maximum benefit from this temporary-housing program. I feel that all allocations made under the original act should be fulfilled and that those 3,730 units coming under categories 1 and 2 should also be completed.

I know something of the great increase in cost of the projects over the estimates and I can sympathize with the Federal Public Housing Administration in the problems which it has faced in connection with this program.

In my district, the citizenry has been justly aroused because of the exorbitant cost per unit—so much so that an investigation is now under way to determine the reason—and I believe that every precaution should now be taken to hold down this cost. It may well be that if the projects now being held up are again started toward completion this high cost per unit will be considerably whittled down. There is no question but what the cost per unit was greatly affected when the majority of the units were not completed.

It will also be noted in the committee's hearings that the cost of the units increased on a Nation-wide scale before the program was well under way and that was a major reason for the high cost which drew such unfavorable criticism throughout the country.

Which is all the more reason why this House should give the FHFA the additional funds asked in the gentleman's amendment. Let us try to avoid another break-down in the program which will leave further bad taste with the public.

This is an important matter to many veterans. We have not gone near far enough in trying to get at an honest solution of the housing program. Every veteran cannot afford to build or buy a house—as a matter of fact very, very few can at the present cost. We must provide this temporary, low-rental housing for him in as great a volume as possible.

The units allotted throughout the Nation under the original appropriation were few enough—it is unthinkable that this Congress will not see to it that at least this small number of units are completed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am definitely in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, because I think there is a definite and positive need for additional money that this bill does not supply for these temporary units. I am speaking from experience in my district. I do not know how it affects you in your less densely populated areas. But where we have some 15,000 student veterans going to college in Los Angeles County in southern California, where we have more than 15,000 making application for homes and we cannot find them, where the projects that were originally started under the original bill are only one-third completed, and this bill will hardly finish the job, and where the funds provided in this bill do nothing at all for the projects that are knocked down and have not come to the 10 percent completion category, I think additional funds are needed.

For what little we can get out of it I am speaking also for the need in other parts of the Nation. As much as we want to practice economy here, I am certainly not for economizing where these boys and their families do not have a place to live. When I said that, I mean that if they do have a place it is a very inadequate trailer or in the back of a car or some makeshift chicken coop.

The Governor of our State was here this week and he informed us that the

population increase in the State of California is 25 percent of the total population increase in the United States since 1940, which is about 2,500,000. Of that 2,500,000, at least 50 percent are in southern California. We sent 700,000 men into the war. We have 900,000 veterans in the State of California at the present time. 200,000 of them are from all States in the Union. We want these boys taken care of. We do not care where they come from. They do not have sufficient housing there.

As much as I prefer that this should be a permanent housing project rather than a temporary housing project, I think the expediency of the situation requires immediate action, and we should not be so close to the line that we cannot do whatever we can with these projects that are 10 percent completed.

With reference to this particular project that I referred to, it will not be completed sufficiently under the terms of this bill. There are many, many units that are knocked down and half completed and are, of course, not completed to the extent of 10 percent, and they will be on the ground rusting away.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. RILEY. The gentleman referred to permanent housing. It is going to be several years before the colleges can have permanent housing and in the meantime these married veterans will have passed out into the world to earn their living and they will be deprived of their education.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. I am certainly wholeheartedly in favor of everything he has said. Is it not true that the State of California and the city of Los Angeles have to date expended about \$534,000 on site work relating to these projects?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is a very important point, and I am glad the gentleman mentioned it. There has been no penny pinching as far as the State of California is concerned in preparing for these sites. I understand that we have spent not that amount, but \$834,000 has been spent out of the funds of the State of California. There is now a bill before the State legislature to complete temporary building units in the event the Federal Government failed in its contract that they made with us when this original bill passed. I think it is a sad commentary on the responsibility of the Congress. I do not disagree altogether with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations when he says that there is inefficiency in the administration of it, but there is also a necessary expediency to be met.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes to which I am entitled at this time. I want to wholeheartedly endorse the raising of this amount. It applies not only to the district of the gentleman from South

Carolina [Mr. RILEY] but to districts all over the Nation, including my own. I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER] will offer an amendment to which the committee has agreed.

I want to thank the committee because I realize it means a great deal to us in California who have at this time, according to our senatorial housing survey report of the State Senate of California, a shortage of 743,000 units. Twenty-five percent of those are estimated to be units which would be available for veterans.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. It is true we appreciate the contemplated action of the committee, but nevertheless we doubt very much whether that will be a sufficient amount to finish up the number of houses which are needed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am afraid it would not be, but I am sure it will finish many units which are vitally needed at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There are 400 at Fort Devens in my district. They will not be available to the veterans unless the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I will take only a minute. The chairman of the committee has told us there are about 3,700 structures which will not be put up, although the walls and necessary physical structure are available, because it costs too much. We know very well that if these structures are not erected under this program it is not going to be done for a long time, because some other way must be found by these institutions to do it.

I have communications from my district pleading for housing for student veterans. I think this is no time, in the interest of the veterans of this country, to stop because it will cost a couple of thousand dollars more to build each unit. The important thing now is to get these accommodations. Therefore, I intend to support this amendment on that ground. It is a question of getting the housing for the veterans when it is available, because if it is not gotten now it will be wasted.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GAMBLE. The gentleman is referring to Camp Shanks, is he not? I mean the colleges that use Camp Shanks?

Mr. JAVITS. I include the needs of all the five great colleges and universities in my district.

Mr. GAMBLE. Well, that is included here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would virtually restore the 3,730 units which we have taken from the program. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], I assume, inasmuch as he increases the amount by \$9,000,000, contends that the program can be completed with \$9,000,000, whereas the FPFA requests \$15,000,000 to do that job. Now, it is very uncertain whether it could be done with \$9,000,000. I wonder if we would want to do it for the reason that this construction is very costly construction. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. YOUNGBLOOD] called attention to the fact that in the process of demolition, transportation, and reconstructing them there was additional cost. Now, have in mind that these projects were stopped because of the unusually high cost of rebuilding them as temporary structures. Now, why? Let us compare the cost per unit of this temporary program with the unit cost of the permanents which we have built. The permanents today, including not only the physical properties, the building itself, but the real estate, were constructed for an average of \$4,461 per unit. This program was stopped because, if we were to go ahead with these 3,730 units, the construction of the temporary units alone would average \$4,100. So, taking into consideration the value of the land, site improvement, and so forth, upon which these temporaries were located, it would bring the cost of these temporary units up to something over \$6,000. That is why it was stopped to begin with. We feel we can justify going ahead with 90 percent of this program because so much work has been done on the 90 percent that it is merely investing for the purpose of saving the money we have already spent.

The estimated average cost of completing these units, the 90 percent of them, is only \$2,725. It just cannot be justified that we appropriate any part of the \$15,000,000 in the hope that we can complete these 3,730 units for as little as we can construct permanent homes; and our objective, of course, is to provide permanent homes for these veterans, not temporary shacks. Some of them are little better than shacks.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Are the figures the gentleman quoted on the Quonset hut type of construction? Certainly the Quonset hut type does not cost as much as the gentleman quoted.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I was giving the average.

Mr. McDONOUGH. All right, but take the Quonset hut, and many of them have been constructed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have to deal with averages. We cannot deal with separate units. Congress has not the time to take each separate building project apart and put it together again to see if it is economically sound.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But if funds are not provided, there will be not hundreds but thousands of veterans without homes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Our interest and objective is the building of permanent units for veterans.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Yes; but we are not doing it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But we can provide for it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There is no provision for it in this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is no reason why we should expend more money than is economically sound. It can be done in some cases. We find that in the case of these houses that we can spend on the average of about \$2,000 more and provide permanent housing.

Mr. McDONOUGH. We have a lot of veterans who are without adequate housing waiting for the present program. That is not here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Nobody is more concerned with providing housing for veterans or anybody else than I and this committee. Tomorrow we expect to report out a bill which will make many thousands of units available to veterans. I think the gentleman will be very well satisfied with our endeavors when we get through with the program.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee if the committee action on this bill gave any consideration to a number of other bills that are pending with regard to the fact that when these houses were demolished and removed and reconstructed in these municipalities, and particularly at colleges, that the title to that housing as reconstructed might remain in those colleges? Because it would probably cost more to demolish them as now required by the Lanham Act than it would to let them remain.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I know what the gentleman has in mind, but we must remember that in the case of these particular structures some were erected on leased property. We did not take a fee title to the property but they were put up as temporary structures on leased property and we have a guaranty in the lease contract that we will restore this property to its original condition. That means the houses must be demolished. Otherwise we have got to get fee title. That is something that will take more time than we have to devote to it here today. We cannot decide that in 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But the committee is giving consideration to it?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assure the gentleman that the committee will give consideration to that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken: and on a division (demanded by Mr. McDONOUGH

and Mr. RILEY) there were—yeas 26, noes 46.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment may be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the committee amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "\$460,000,000" and insert "\$445,500,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. That the additional funds herein authorized shall be available to carry out the purposes of sections 501, 502, and 503 of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended, but shall be available only for necessary expenses in (1) completing the provision of temporary housing (including dwelling units not under construction) for which a contract in writing with any educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization had been made prior to the enactment hereof pursuant to title V of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended, and (2) reimbursing any such educational institution, State or political subdivision thereof, local public agency, or nonprofit organization (a) for funds expended by it in completing any such temporary housing (exclusive of the costs of site acquisition and preparation, or the installation of streets and utility mains), or (b) for the cost of utility and other work in connection with any such temporary housing performed by it for the Administrator on a reimbursable basis pursuant to section 502 (b) of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "(including dwelling units not under construction)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 9, strike out "amended" and insert "amended: Provided, That such additional funds shall not be available for completing suspended units with respect to which, prior to April 1, 1947, no expenditures were made by the Administrator or the only expenditures made by the Administrator were for dismantling or dismantling and transportation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 24, strike out "amended" and insert "amended, and (3) making payment, in an aggregate amount not exceeding \$500,000, to such educational institutions, States, or political subdivisions thereof, local public agencies and nonprofit organizations of amounts equal to actual expenditures made by them prior to April 1, 1947, for costs of site acquisition and preparation, or installation of streets and utility mains, with respect to suspended units referred to in the proviso in clause (1) above."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLETCHER: Page 2, line 25, after the word "payment" strike out the words "in an aggregate amount not exceeding \$500,000."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, the FPFA unwittingly gave the Banking and Currency Committee the wrong details regarding the projects and amount of money needed to complete projects under discussion. After the FPFA had more time to thoroughly go into the question it found several hundred thousand dollars, more or less, might be needed to reimburse the various cities and political subdivisions for money spent on projects that were not completed—that is, the projects not within the 10 percent of completion—which we were striking from the bill. It was the intention of the committee to completely reimburse the political subdivisions, the cities, and educational bodies for the moneys which they had spent in the preparation of sites and utilities.

The bill which is the companion to this one in the Senate is identical with our bill with the exception of this particular phrase. They have not this \$500,000 figure in the Senate bill, and I offer this amendment to make the House bill come in agreement with the Senate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FLETCHER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCGREGOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2780) to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," pursuant to House Resolution 199, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 854, a companion bill to the bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substitute the provisions of the bill H. R. 2780 just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill H. R. 2780 was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Friday for the Committee on Appropriations to file a privileged report on the Navy Department appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce the program for next week.

On Monday we will have memorial services here in the House of Representatives, and I express the hope that as many Members as possible will be in attendance.

On Tuesday we will call the Private Calendar and then will take up the Navy Department appropriation bill. It is expected that the consideration of that bill will continue through Wednesday and possibly Thursday.

After the completion of the Navy Department appropriation bill we expect to take up S. 814, the so-called wool bill, and also H. Res. 176, which is an investigatory resolution for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Conference reports on H. J. Res. 153, the so-called foreign relief bill, and H. R. 3020, the so-called labor bill, will be in order at any time if such reports are ready for consideration.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman have any information at this time in regard to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which we understood was coming up Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot say when that will come up, but I will say it will not be on the program for next week.

TENTH REPORT TO CONGRESS ON OPERATIONS OF UNRRA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 254)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I am transmitting herewith the tenth quarterly report covering the operations of UNRRA and the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress for this purpose.

During the quarter under review—October 1, 1946, to December 31, 1946—estimated shipments of supplies from the United States to UNRRA receiving countries amounted to approximately 1,813,192 tons, valued at approximately \$182,732,000. Cumulative world shipments by UNRRA as of December 31, 1946, were approximately 19,385,870 tons, valued at approximately \$2,311,225,000. Of these totals, shipments from the United States were approximately 14,890,685 tons, valued at approximately \$1,664,082,000 or, respectively, 75 percent and 72 percent of the total.

The approximate value of supplies remaining to be shipped on January 1, 1947, was a world total of \$660,000,000.

Two developments at the turn of the year impelled the Central Committee of UNRRA to make adjustments in the categories of supplies still to be shipped from the United States. The first was a critical shortage of food, affecting particularly Austria, Poland, and Greece. The second was the fact that certain items being procured in the United States could not be delivered in time for shipment to Europe by March 31, 1947, or to the Far East by June 30, 1947. As a result the proposal of UNRRA was adopted by the Central Committee on February 3, 1947, for the establishment of an emergency food program in the amount of \$35,000,000. This amount was to be obtained from contracts which could not be shipped before the dead lines

to the value of \$25,000,000 an amount of \$4,000,000 from the Director General's reserve, and an amount of \$3,000,000 from the Czechoslovakian program on the basis of information that Czechoslovakia's relative recovery far exceeded that of other recipient countries. The food program was distributed so that Austria would receive \$20,000,000, Poland \$11,000,000, and Greece \$4,000,000.

Thus UNRRA, by shifting its remaining resources, was able to meet a serious food deficit in the first quarter of 1947. I mention this particular fact to illustrate that the specter of hunger is still close to the peoples of many liberated areas. It is this condition which it is intended that the United States will help to relieve through a 1947 United States relief program. We cannot allow our vast efforts through UNRRA and through other means to remain incomplete. It will take a relatively small amount in 1947 to help assure that most liberated countries finally will be able to meet their own needs without free assistance from outside sources.

In addition to its task of providing supplies to devastated countries, UNRRA has carried out a second major responsibility, that of caring for displaced persons. Several hundred thousand displaced persons will be unrepatriated on June 30, 1947, when the resources available to UNRRA will be exhausted. The United Nations has voted to assume the responsibility for these displaced persons through an International Refugee Organization to be composed of member nations. I have recommended to the Congress that the United States join the IRO and that we appropriate the sum \$75,000,000 as the United States share of the operating fund which is required for the care of these unfortunate people.

The Congress now is considering a joint resolution which provides the sum of \$350,000,000 for relief assistance by the United States to the people of countries devastated by war. This sum is comparatively small in relation to amounts already made available by this Government through various means. It is an amount, however, which is of tremendous importance in completing the vast efforts we already have made. Other countries which can make contributions for relief assistance in 1947 have been consulted through the Secretariat of the United Nations and through other channels.

The United States has the resources needed by war-devastated countries to carry them through this year into a new year in which most of them may hope that they will achieve economic recovery. The peace of the world can be realized only when people are free from the fear of hunger.

The goal is close. The United States can help many countries reach that goal in a few more months through the supplies which the joint resolution on relief assistance will provide. I have no doubt that the American people desire that we finish what UNRRA has so well begun.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 15, 1947.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to include certain tables in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an open letter to the President written by him.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to include in his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole a telegram from a civic body in Los Angeles.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BENNETT of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), for 5 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. BENDER (at the request of Mr. ARENDT), for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE PALESTINE SITUATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues may be interested in a brief report of a visit which I made to the first committee of the United Nations General Assembly which considered the terms of reference and constitution of the 11-member Special Committee on the Palestine Question just appointed. This session served to crystallize for me the Palestine issue and the relationship to it of the United States in such a way as may prove of interest to the House. The representatives of the Jewish Agency and the Arab Higher Committee of Palestine both testified. The Jewish Agency representative claimed that the establishment of the Jewish national home was to have been the process, while the Jewish commonwealth would be the consummation of Jewish aspirations in Palestine. He asked for an open door to immigration and land settlement in Palestine for the displaced and utterly desperate Jews in Europe. But the Arab position was of special interest due to its peculiar intransigence.

The representative of the Palestine Arab Higher Committee said that the Arabs will not consider or even discuss the meaning of the Jewish national home, that they want immediate and complete stoppage of all immigration into Palestine and refuse, in advance, any solution—like partition—impairing or diminishing Arab sovereignty in the whole or any part of Palestine.

My experience here reported follows an exchange of correspondence on Palestine with Secretary of State Marshall by 30 Members on the Republican side of the House of whom I was one. We asked Secretary Marshall three questions, all directed toward ascertaining the United States policy with respect to the instant proceedings before the United Nations Assembly on Palestine. The Secretary of

State answered in substance that "it would be premature for this Government to develop its policy with regard to the substance of this question in such a way as to limit the full utilization of that committee's"—the United Nations Special Committee—"recommendations and its report."

This reply and what I observed at the United Nations session induced in me the conviction that our Government was giving, though probably unwittingly, a distinct impression to the people of the United States and to the nations of the world represented in the United Nations, that we may be abandoning our long standing and often reiterated policy in favor of the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine, for an attitude of cool neutrality. Such an impression should not be permitted to be created or to persist.

All of us know that a decision on Palestine without United States support will not be worth much, and that the United States must take a hand in implementing a decision if it is ever to be carried out. Unless we give that assurance now, the special committee will decide little if anything. The United States attitude, therefore, will determine whether or not the Palestine problem will be solved by the United States.

From what I have seen already, it is not too early to call for a three-point program for United States action on Palestine in the United Nations. First, that the United States shall say now unequivocally that the United States policy has not changed, that we support the promise of the Jewish national home in Palestine and the opening of Palestine to full Jewish immigration compatible with its economic capacity, and that we will state before the United Nations Special Committee of Inquiry just what the United States will do to implement a solution. Second, that we will take a part in a Palestine settlement. The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry, for example, made a number of recommendations regarding the equalization of standards of living and standards of education between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. It recommended plans for large scale agricultural and industrial development in Palestine. Such plans will take money—the Jews of the world will put up a good deal of it, but the United States even with modest contributions for this purpose could help enormously in the certainty of the result. Again, the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry suggested a trusteeship under the United Nations to see Palestine through a transitory period until a commonwealth could be achieved. Will the United States consent to be one of the trustees and to participate in the negotiation of a trusteeship agreement? Third, the focal point of disaffection in Palestine and in the world regarding Palestine is the stoppage of immigration. The United States could urge upon the special committee that it make interim recommendations for immigration into Palestine until a final solution is agreed to. Declarations on these questions would be policy and would look much different to the people of the United States and the people of

the world than the statement in Secretary Marshall's letter of May 5 that "it would be premature for this Government to develop its policy with regard to the future government of Palestine."

The United States insisted in the United Nations on a neutral committee of nations. If we are to take the State Department and the United States delegate at their word, then the United States should have been a member of such a committee because it is neutral. I do not imply any criticism of either our distinguished Secretary of State to whom I pay the greatest honor, or of our eminent and gracious delegate to the United Nations. I feel rather that it is our fault in the Congress and among the people that we have not made our position so crystal clear on Palestine, that our Secretary of State and our delegate to the United Nations would speak out without hesitation at this session of the general assembly for the redemption of the promise of the Jewish national home, and for Jewish immigration into and close settlement on the land of Palestine.

We have had other experiences with this kind of dealing by the United States Government regarding Palestine which could happen here again. At almost the same time that the President was giving assurances regarding Palestine to the Jews in the United States late in 1944 and in 1945, he was on April 5, 1945, writing to Ibn-Saud, the King of Saudi Arabia, that the United States would take no action on Palestine "without full consultation with both Arabs and Jews," or "which might prove hostile to the Arab people." This declaration arose to plague President Truman when he was advised on October 5, 1946, by King Ibn-Saud that the Government of Saudi Arabia considered his demand for the admission of 100,000 Jewish displaced persons into Palestine to be a contradiction "of previous promises made by the Government of the United States," certainly not a pretty position for the United States to be placed in.

The United States policy on Palestine is clear, and it must be emphatically stated, certainly to the Arabs, and to the world. On December 19, 1945, the Congress in Concurrent Resolution 44 stated that—

The United States shall use its good offices with the mandatory power to the end that Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country to the maximum of its agricultural and economic potentialities, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization and development so that they may freely proceed with the upbuilding of Palestine as the Jewish National Home and, in association with all elements of the population, establish Palestine as a democratic commonwealth in which all men, regardless of race or creed, shall have equal rights.

The President clearly stated the executive policy in his letter to King Ibn-Saud of October 26, 1946. He said that—

The Government and people of the United States have given support to the concept of a Jewish National Home in Palestine ever since the termination of World War I which resulted in the freeing of a large area of the Near East, including Palestine, and the establishment of a number of independent states which are now members of the United Nations.

This followed a long line of similar declarations, beginning in 1919, by Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Roosevelt. Not only does this represent the official policy of the United States, but it reflects the understanding of all our people. On July 2, 1945, a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress in a communication to the President said:

We earnestly request you to use your influence with the Government of Great Britain, the mandatory for Palestine, to open forthwith the doors of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization; and we hope that you will urge all interested governments to join with the United States toward the end of establishing Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth at the earliest possible time.

On the same date in a petition to the President, the Governors of 40 of the 48 States joined in the same policy pronouncement as follows:

We believe that the time has come when concrete measures must be taken to open the doors of Palestine to Jewish mass immigration and colonization and to bring about the earliest transformation of that country into a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth, and we most earnestly urge you to take such action as will contribute to this end.

There can be no question about the international covenant undertaken to the Jewish people. The Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, said:

His Majesty's Government views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people and will use their best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object.

This declaration was incorporated in the mandate granted to Great Britain by the League of Nations which said:

Whereas the principal Allied Powers have also agreed that the mandatory should be responsible for putting into effect the declaration originally made on the 2d of November 1917, between the Government of His Britannic Majesty, and adopted by the said powers in favor of the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.

And in article 2 continued:

The mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home.

The United States is a party to this international covenant. In the American-British Palestine Mandate Convention of December 3, 1924, it was stated:

Subject to the provisions of the present convention, the United States consents to the administration of Palestine by His Britannic Majesty, pursuant to the mandate recited above.

Yet, in the face of these solemn international covenants and commitments, Great Britain promulgated its infamous white paper of May 1939, arbitrarily cutting off the right of the Jews to settle closely upon the land of Palestine and to make it their Jewish national home. Britain has persisted in this action since that date with the result that Palestine is a police state, ridden with terror, deprived of elementary civil rights or the equal protection of the laws, and barring from its gates hundreds of thousands of

Jewish refugees and DP's, the remnant of the martyred Jews of Europe.

At the session of the United Nations Political Committee, to which I referred, I was amazed to hear not only the intransigence of the Palestinian Arab Higher Committee, but the threats and belligerency of the other Arab countries. The delegate of Iraq, declared that Jewish immigration into Palestine as guaranteed by the mandate would be a declaration of war, and an invitation to fighting. He said such immigration would show the aggressive intentions of the Jews against the Arab countries. These words sounded strangely reminiscent of Hitler who declared against the aggressive intentions of the Poles and the Jews at the same time that they were being gassed and cremated. The Arabs demanded the immediate independence of Palestine—a palpable effort to freeze the status quo of an Arab majority without any reference to the fact that an illegal British policy barring Jewish immigration had left out the 500,000 Jews from Europe, who the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry estimated would emigrate from Europe to Palestine if allowed to do so. This number alone would give the Jews parity in population with the Arabs.

The question we face is whether the democratic nations will permit themselves to be bullied by feudal princes and landowners holding millions of Arabs in abject subjection in their own countries. Who is making these threats against the peace of the world and accusing the unfortunate displaced Jews of aggressive intentions? Palestine consists of 10,000 square miles of territory while 1,000,000 square miles were conquered from the Turks by the Allied Powers in World War I, and established as territory of the future Arab states which have all now come into being. Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Transjordan, and Saudi Arabia are all the results of that action. Anyone who has been in the Middle East, as I have, knows that the Arab countries have not begun to approach the development, even as sovereign nations, which Jews in a little over a decade have accomplished in a mandated Palestine. Yet I am sure that the people of these countries and their more enlightened leaders want a better and more secure life fully as much as do the Jews of Palestine.

But we find in many Arab countries a high rate of illiteracy, a ghastly rate of infant mortality, a short life expectancy for the ordinary people, the crude conditions of life, and a society in which 2 percent rule the 98 percent with an iron hand. Millions of dollars in oil royalties have, for instance, gone into certain of these countries, but has there been any appreciable improvement in schools, hospitals, roads, sanitation, housing, or other attributes of a modern civilization for the people? Of course not.

In view of the threats of the delegate from Iraq we have a right to inquire as to the competence of such threats in the Middle East. The Iraqi Army numbers about 25,000 men without motorized equipment to cross the Arabian Desert separating Iraq from Palestine. The Egyptian Army numbers 60,000 trained for police duty and without equipment

to cross the desert of Sinai separating Egypt from Palestine. The Syrian and Lebanese armies number at the most 20,000 trained for police duty. The Saudi-Arabian Army consists of a few thousand regulars, and otherwise of tribal levies difficult to muster into a military force. The Trans-Jordan Army totals 16,000 and is a creation of the British and under British officers. I believe that the Jews of Palestine, given half a break on equipment, will be perfectly ready to rest on their own ability to cope with all Arab forces which may be directed against them formally or informally. I would doubt very much that any of the belligerent Arab spokesmen, who know very well that the Palestinian Jew knows how to fight and how to die, believe themselves that they are scaring anybody. And this is quite apart from the fact that no Arab nation or group of them would seriously attempt to challenge the authority of the United Nations.

The fundamental problem in the world and the problem upon which we voted the other day in the matter of the Greek-Turkish loan, is whether we will have an open or a closed world. In an open world international covenants undertaken to the Jewish people who are in desperate need will be honored. In a closed world they will be dishonored. The greatest threat of communism in the whole Middle East rests in a perpetuation of the semi-feudal social system and in the economic exploitation which exists there making it ready soil for Communist agitation. The Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry called the civilization which they found in the Middle East semifeudal.

The delegate from Iraq at the United Nations when I was there the other day said that his government would not "adhere" to any plan for a "bridgehead" into the East of the type of civilization represented by the Jews. That gave the game away better than anything else. The real hope of Western civilization lies in the gradual opening of this area to improved standards of living and an understanding of Western ideas which will enable the Arab peoples to become democratic in organization and aspiration. The real threat of communism in the Near East and the Middle East lies in leaving these feudal princes and landlords to sit on the inferno of a social and economic caste system, ready material for the torch of communism. The Jews, the Arab rank and file and the more enlightened leaders among the Arabs, have completely common interests.

The delegate of the USSR to the United Nations has not hesitated to recommend specific solutions for his government, first coming out for an immediate independent Arab state in Palestine and now recognizing the Jewish case to the extent of suggesting a bi-national state or even partition. Yet the USSR is a newcomer to the Palestine question while the United States which has been deeply concerned with it since 1917 takes no specific position at all before the General Assembly. This is certainly a challenge to the failure of the United States to restate to the General Assembly its historic policy on Palestine.

In the next few months there will be weighed in the balance the bona fides of all the protestations of support for the Jewish National Home made by our Presidents, our Congress and our people since the issue was first opened in 1917. The smaller nations of the world will be watching not the words, but the performance of the United States on this Palestine question. Either international covenants to people in desperate need and without armies and navies will be honored, or the world is still entirely ruled by threats and power politics.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 938. An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 19, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

683. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

684. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

685. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of three newly issued publications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

686. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$29,500 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 250); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

687. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of \$75,000,000 for surplus property, care and handling overseas (H. Doc. No. 251); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

688. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 involving an increase of \$92,107,800, together with an increase of \$38,400,000 in contractual authority, for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. 252); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

689. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 253); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

690. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations which was approved by the General

Assembly by a resolution adopted on February 13, 1946, proposing the convention for accession by each member of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 176. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 212. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States; without amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEBERT:

H. R. 3479. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of Louisiana of that portion of the Jackson Barracks Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3480. A bill to amend the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, so as to increase the maximum and minimum monthly compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3481. A bill to amend section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 3482. A bill to amend section 403 (d) of the Revenue Act of 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3483. A bill to amend section 452 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 3484. A bill to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 3485. A bill to provide for the renewal of certain patents which expire during 1947 and 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 3486. A bill to amend section 701 (d) of the Revenue Act of 1943 with respect to the effective date of subsection (1) (1) (E) of the Renegotiation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3487. A bill to abolish the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge in Essex County, Mass., to authorize and direct the restoration to the former owners of the land comprising such refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 3488. A bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such

citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 3489. A bill to amend and supplement various Federal statutes, as amended, having for their purpose to provide a permanent formula for arriving at parity prices for farm commodities; to provide administrative agencies to be responsible for the carrying out of this act and existing laws pertinent thereto; to promote the greatest normal economic exchange of goods and services among the people of the United States and with the people of other nations; to protect the people of this country and their property from the recurring evils of world-wide inflation and deflation; to stabilize the purchasing power of money; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUHLBERG:

H. R. 3490. A bill to enable States and their agencies and political subdivisions to plan for the construction of public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON (by request):

H. R. 3491. A bill to amend the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 2, 1945, with particular reference to Intercoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee to the Anclote River, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3492. A bill to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 3493. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 3494. A bill to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant its consent to uniform taxation of certain Indian properties which are taxed by the Federal Government and which are immune or claimed to be immune from State taxation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to certain bills on the subject of canceling the authority of the city of Los Angeles to purchase certain public lands in Mono County; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the rate of interest on land sales, and requesting the Congress of the United States to approve amendments herein set forth of chapter 78 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 3495. A bill for the relief of Andrew C. Extrom and Harry C. Pearson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Corp. Joseph B. Konkolewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3497. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 3498. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Kraus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

H. R. 3499. A bill for the relief of Petrol Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 3500. A bill for the relief of Lester L. Elder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

517. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Rehoboth Lodge, No. 38, B'nai B'rith, New York City, urging immediate large-scale Jewish immigration into Palestine and the removal forthwith of the discriminatory land restrictions in the Jewish national home; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

518. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Irish Freedom League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to England's occupation of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

519. Also, petition of the National Pan Hellenic Council, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the appropriation bill for the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 16, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, when we get sick of ourselves, ashamed of our littleness, our selfishness, and the petty things that irritate us, then let it be the beginning of spiritual health by making us willing to have Thee create in us clean hearts and renew right spirits within us. Hold us steady lest we lose our poise. Blunt our speech lest by cutting words and careless deeds we hurt our colleagues and the cause for which we speak. Where we differ in approaches to a problem, may we ever be open to consider another and a better way, guided, not by whether it be popular, or expedient, or practical, but always whether it be right.

Hear our prayer, O Lord, and help us, through Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 15, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 854) to amend section 502 (a) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate today is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, which will be read.

The unanimous-consent agreement was read, as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, May 16, 1947, at the hour of 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment that may be pending, or that may be subsequently proposed, to the amendment proposed to the bill S. 526, the National Science Foundation Act of 1947, by Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. McGRATH), on page 14, after line 8, relating to mandatory amounts to be distributed to the various States, and upon the said amendment, whether or not amended.

Ordered further. That the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day and the hour of 1 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under a further unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has the floor.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, according to the unanimous-consent agreement arrived at yesterday, the Senate will vote at 1 o'clock on the pending amendment, the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. In continuation of the debate of yesterday, I desire to say a few words on the amendment, but I shall be happy to yield to other Senators who may desire to speak